

UC-NRLF



B 3 953 692





NESTORIUS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER



Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET
Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS
New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.
Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

All rights reserved

NESTORIUS AND HIS PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

by

FRIEDRICH LOOFS, D.D., PHIL.D.

Professor of Church History in the University
of Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

Cambridge:
at the University Press
1914

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PREFACE

IN this small book I publish four lectures which I was invited to give in a course of "advanced lectures in theology" at the University of London, March, 1913. The lectures were for the most part originally written in German. I translated them with the kind assistance of Miss Ida Southall, M.A., of Birmingham, then a guest at my house. But it is not she alone to whom I am indebted. I have also to thank my dear host during my stay in London, Professor H. J. White, who read two of my lectures before I gave them, and the corrector of the Cambridge University Press and two of our American students, Mr H. Harper, B.A., of Avalan (U.S.A.), and Mr Charles Baillie, B.D., of Picton (Canada), whose kind suggestions I often utilized in reading the proofs. However, I beg my readers to put it to my account, that in spite of all these friendly helpers, the German author very often reveals himself.

In quoting Nestorius' "Book of Heraclides" I have given the pages both of the Syriac text and of Nau's French translation—not in order to raise in my reader's mind the idea that I made use of the Syriac text.

Having forgotten nearly all I once knew of Syriac, I examined the Syriac text with the help of various friends only in a very few places, and I realize how much the ordinary use of the French translation alone is to be regarded as a defect in my lectures. I have quoted the numbers of the pages of the original Syriac text, as given by Nau, only in order that in this way the places where the quotations are to be found may be more accurately indicated than by merely quoting the pages of Nau's translation.

Since this book went to press I have made the acquaintance of a lecture by Dr Junglas, a Roman-Catholic scholar, entitled *Die Irrlehre des Nestorius* (Trier, 1912, 29 pages), and of the interesting chapters on "the tragedy of Nestorius" and "the council of Chalcedon" in L. Duchesne's *Histoire ancienne de l'Église* (tom. III, Paris, 1911, pp. 313-388 and 389-454). The latter makes little use of the newly discovered *Liber Heraclidis* and does not give much detail about the teaching of Nestorius. Nevertheless I regret very much that I did not know earlier this treatment of the matter, surely more learned and more impartial than any other of Roman-Catholic origin. Dr Junglas in giving a short delineation of Nestorius' "heresy" has utilized the "Book of Heraclides" and, in my opinion, made some valuable remarks about the terminology of Nestorius which are not to be found elsewhere. However, in his one short lecture he was

not able to go into details, and there are many things which he has failed to observe. There is a third Roman-Catholic research into the doctrine of Nestorius (Jugie, article “*Éphèse, concile de*” in the *Dictionnaire de la théologie catholique*, Fasc. 37, Paris, 1911, pp. 137–163), which, as I understand, endeavours more eagerly than Dr Junglas to show that Nestorius was justly condemned; but I have not had the opportunity to read this article.

As regards my own treatment of the matter, I do not pretend to have exhausted the subject nor to have found the definite and final answers to the various questions aroused about Nestorius’ life and doctrine by his *Liber Heraclidis*. I trust that I have indicated more clearly than Professor Bethune-Baker has already done the way by which we may arrive at a real understanding of Nestorius’ peculiar ideas. Others, I hope, may be stimulated by the present lectures to a further study of Nestorius’ christology. The subject is deserving of interest. For there is no other christology in the ancient church so “modern” as his and perhaps that of his teachers whose dogmatical works are lost.

F. L.

HALLE ON THE SAALE, GERMANY,
January 20th, 1914.

I

THE subject of my lectures—"Nestorius and his position in the history of Christian Doctrine"—seems at the first glance to have little interest for us modern men. Almost 1500 years have passed since Nestorius played his rôle in history. And this rôle was in the orthodox church a very transitory one.

For the Persian-Nestorian or Syrian-Nestorian church (as the language of this church was Syriac) Nestorius, it is true, became a celebrated saint; and still to-day small remains of this once far-reaching church are to be found in the vicinity of the Urmia Lake in the north-west of Persia and south of it in the mountains of Turkish Kurdistan. But in the orthodox church Nestorius was even in his own time an ephemeral appearance. In the year 428 A.D. he became bishop of Constantinople and as early as 431 he was deposed. Four years later he was banished to Oasis in Egypt, and up to a few years ago the common opinion was that he died soon after in his exile.

For the orthodox church he remained merely one of the most condemned heretics. He was reproached not

only for having forbidden the title *θεοτόκος*, mother of God, as applied to Mary the virgin, but it was told of him that he, separating the divine and the human nature of Christ, saw in our Saviour nothing but an inspired man¹. What was right in his statements, viz. his opposition to all monophysitic thinking, was held to be maintained by the famous letter of Leo the Great to Flavian of Constantinople of the year 449, acknowledged by the council of Chalcedon, and by the creed of that council itself. The rest of what he taught was regarded as erroneous and not worth the notice of posterity.

That this is not a tenable theory I hope to prove in my lectures.

To-day it is my aim merely to show that just at the present time different circumstances have led to the awakening of a fresh interest in Nestorius.

The church of the ancient Roman Empire did not punish its heretics merely by deposition, condemnation, banishment and various deprivations of rights, but, with the purpose of shielding its believers against poisonous influence, it destroyed all heretical writings. No work of Arius, Marcellus, Aetius and Eunomius *e.g.*, not to speak of the earlier heretics, has been preserved in more than fragments consisting of quotations by their opponents. A like fate was purposed for the writings

¹ Comp. Socrates, h. e. 7, 32, 6 ed. Gaisford ii, 806; Evagrius, h. e. 1, 7 ed. Bidez and Parmentier, p. 14, 6.

of Nestorius: an edict of the Emperor Theodosius II, dating from the 30th of July 435 ordered them to be burnt¹. Even the Persian church, about the same time won over to Nestorianism, had to suffer under this edict: only a few works of Nestorius came into its possession for translation into Syriac.

This we learn through Ebed-Jesu, metropolitan of Nisibis (†1318), the most famous theologian of the Nestorians in the middle ages and who has given us the most complete account of the writings of Nestorius. He introduces in his catalogue of Syrian authors² the notice about Nestorius with the following words: *Nestorius the patriarch wrote many excellent books which the blasphemers (viz. the Antinestorians) have destroyed.* As those which evaded destruction he mentions, besides the liturgy of Nestorius, *i.e.* one of the liturgies used by the Nestorians, which without doubt is wrongly ascribed to Nestorius, five works of the patriarch. The first of these is the book called *Tragedy*, the second the *Book of Heraclides*, the third the *Letter addressed to Cosmas*, the fourth a *Book of letters* and the fifth a *Book of homilies and sermons*.

For us the edict of Theodosius against the writings of Nestorius has had a still more important result. Until 1897 nothing was known about the second book

¹ Cod. Theodos. 16, 5, 66; Mansi, v, 413 f.

² J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, III, 1, p. 35 f.

mentioned by Ebed-Jesu, *i.e.* about the *Book of Heraclides*. Also the *Letter addressed to Cosmas* mentioned third by Ebed-Jesu had to be counted and is still to be counted as lost¹. Of the three other works ascribed by Ebed-Jesu to Nestorius we had and still have only fragments—occasional quotations in the works of his enemies and his friends.

Among the hostile writings in which we find such fragments are to be named especially the works of his chief opponent Cyril of Alexandria; then the proceedings of the council of Ephesus; then some works of Marius Mercator, a Latin writer who in the time of Nestorius lived in Constantinople and translated a series of quotations from Nestorius given by Cyril, three letters of Nestorius and also, but with considerable omissions, nine of his sermons; finally the church history of Evagrius (living about 590). The latter gives us² an account of two works of Nestorius dating from the time of his exile, one of which must be the *Tragedy*, while the other could not be identified up to the last ten years, and he inserts in his narration extracts from two interesting letters of the banished heretic. Among the friends who preserved for us fragments of Nestorius the Nestorians of later date played a very unimportant part. Important is a Latin work which has connection with the earliest friends of Nestorius, the so-called

¹ Comp. Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, xxiv, 242, 56 ff.

² h. e. 1, 7 ed. Bidez and Parmentier, pp. 12 ff.

Synodicon, known since 1682¹ or, in complete form, since 1873², and which is a later adaptation of a work of Bishop Irenaeus of Tyrus, a partisan of Nestorius, which was entitled "Tragedy" like the lost "Tragedy" of Nestorius, upon which perhaps it was based.

The quotations of these enemies and friends represent, as I said, fragments of three books of Nestorius mentioned by Ebed-Jesu, viz. the *Book of letters*, the *Book of sermons* and the *Tragedy*. The first two of these three works of Nestorius need no further explanation. The third, the *Tragedy*, about which Evagrius and the *Synodicon* teach us, must have been a polemical work, in which Nestorius, as Evagrius says, defended himself against those *who blamed him for having introduced unlawful innovations and for having acted wrongly in demanding the council of Ephesus*³. The title which the book bears must have been chosen because Nestorius told here the tragedy of his life up to his banishment to Oasis in Egypt.

Fragments of other books of Nestorius not mentioned by Ebed-Jesu were not known to us ten years ago⁴.

¹ Ch. LUPUS, *Ad Ephesinum concilium variorum patrum epistolae*, 1682=Mansi, v, 731-1022.

² *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, 1, 49-84. ³ h. e. 1, 7, pp. 12, 24 f.

⁴ We had, it is true, the Anathematisms of Nestorius against Cyril's Anathematisms, and a fragment of his *λογίδια*; but the Anathematisms probably were attached to a letter, and the *λογίδια* (short discourses) perhaps belonged to the *Book of homilies and sermons*.

All the fragments previously known and in addition to them more than 100 new fragments preserved especially by the Syrian-monophysitic literature I collected and edited in 1905 in a volume entitled *Nestorianus*¹. It is with pleasure that here in England I mention the collaboration of the learned English scholar Stanley A. Cook, an expert in Syrian language and literature, without whose help I never could have used the Syriac texts in the British Museum. I will not speak long of the book which this help and that of a German scholar then at Halle, Dr G. Kampffmeyer, enabled me to compose. Three remarks only shall be made. Firstly: The Syriac fragments gave us knowledge of a book of Nestorius not mentioned by Ebed-Jesu, which was written in the form of a dialogue and which was certainly a comprehensive work, although the number of the fragments handed down to us is very small. The title of this work is *The Theopaschites*, that is, the man who thinks God had suffered, a title certainly chosen because Nestorius in this dialogue opposed the Cyrillican party, which he accused of holding a doctrine which imagined the God in Christ suffering.

Secondly: The introductory headings in the Syriac fragments of the sermons of Nestorius in combination with a reconstruction of the order of the leaves in the

¹ *Nestorianus*. Die Fragmente des Nestorius, gesammelt, untersucht und herausgegeben von F. Loofs. Mit Beiträgen von Stanley A. Cook und G. Kampffmeyer, Halle, 1905.

manuscripts used by Marius Mercator and by the council of Ephesus, offered the possibility of arranging the fragments of the sermons of Nestorius in such a manner that more than 30 sermons could be clearly discerned and that not a few of them were recognisable in their essential contents and their characteristics.

Thirdly: By the help of the quotations I succeeded in finding—as did also at almost the same time a Catholic scholar¹ independently of me—the original Greek of one sermon of Nestorius in a sermon preserved in a manuscript at Dresden and printed in 1839 as a work of Chrysostomus. It is a sermon on the high priesthood of Christ in many respects especially characteristic of the teaching of Nestorius.

Thus my *Nestoriana* gave for the first time an opportunity to survey the remains of the works of Nestorius then accessible. They were the first factor in arousing fresh interest in Nestorius. They inspired, as the author himself says, the writing of a monograph on the christology of Nestorius by a Roman Catholic chaplain, Dr Leonhard Fendt².

But the second factor now to be treated is still more important and surely more interesting. Let me give some introductory remarks before treating the subject itself.

¹ S. Haidacher, *Rede des Nestorius über Hebr. 3. 1, überliefert unter dem Nachlass des hl. Chrysostomus* (*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, xxix, 1905, pp. 192–195).

² *Die Christologie des Nestorius*, Kempten, 1910.

Some few heretics of the ancient church were fortunately enabled long after their death to triumph over the condemnation or even destruction which the orthodox church pronounced against their writings.

Of Apollinaris of Laodicea, the heretic whose doctrine was to Nestorius a special cause of offence, we have still not a few writings because the Apollinarists secretly introduced the works of their master into the church literature, inscribing them with the names of orthodox authors of good renown, *e.g.* Athanasius, Julius of Rome, Gregorius Thaumaturgos. Since these *fraudes Apollinaristarum*¹, of which as early as the 6th century some church writers had an idea or at least a suspicion², were carefully examined, a small collection of works of Apollinaris could be made. Prof. Lietzmann of Jena gave such a collection in his *Apollinaris von Laodicea* in the year 1904.

Severus of Antioch, the most conspicuous of the Monophysites of the 6th century, continued to be admired in the Syrian monophysite church, although the orthodox church had anathematized him. Hence not an unimportant part of the works of Severus translated into Syriac has been preserved, especially among the Syriac manuscripts of the British Museum.

¹ Comp. Leontius, *adversus fraudes Apollinaristarum*; Migne, ser. graec. 86, 1947-1976.

² Comp. the preceding note and Nestorius' *ad Constantinopolitanos* (F. Nau, *Nestorius, Le Livre d'Héraclide*, p. 374).

And, besides others¹, your famous countryman E. W. Brooks has, to the great advantage of historical science, begun the publication of this material².

Pelagius, the well-known western contemporary of Nestorius, whose doctrine Augustine opposed, wrote beside other smaller dogmatical works a large commentary on the Epistles of Saint Paul, the original text of which was held to be lost. An orthodox adaptation only of this work, as was the opinion of ancient and modern scholars, existed in a commentary regarded since olden times as belonging to the works of Hieronymus and it has been printed among them. But nobody took much notice of these commentaries; for because they were regarded as having been revised they could teach nothing new about Pelagius, and one could only make use of those thoughts which otherwise were known to be his. Lately we have come by curious bypaths to valuable knowledge about the Pelagius-commentary which we hope will soon put us in possession of the original text of Pelagius. The well-known Celtic scholar, Heinrich Zimmer, formerly professor at the University of Berlin (†1910), was led, as we see in his book *Pelagius in Irland* (1901), to traces of the original Pelagius-commentary by quotations in Irish manuscripts. He

¹ e.g. R. Duval in *Patrologia orientalis*, iv, 1, 1906.

² *The sixth book of the select letters of Severus, Patriarch of Antiochia in the Syriac version etc.*, 2 vols., London, 1902-1904; Hymns in *Patrologia orientalis*, vi, 1, 1910.

even believed he had recovered the original commentary itself; for a manuscript which he found in the monastery of S. Gallen (Switzerland) in his opinion nearly resembled the original text, in spite of some additions, and showed that the *Pseudo-Hieronymus*, *i.e.* the form printed among the works of Hieronymus, was more authentic than was previously supposed. This judgment on the manuscript of S. Gallen and the *Pseudo-Hieronymus* proved, it is true, to be too optimistic. But the investigation, begun by Professor Zimmer, has been furthered by German and English scholars by means of extensive study of manuscripts. Professor A. Souter of Aberdeen, who played a prominent rôle in this research and who really succeeded in finding at Karlsruhe a manuscript of the original Pelagius-commentary, is right in hoping that he will be able to give to theological science the original text of Pelagius within a few years¹.

In a still more curious manner Priscillian, the first heretic, who in consequence of his being accused was finally put to death (385), has been enabled to speak to us in his own words. None of his writings were preserved; we only had the accounts of his opponents. Then there was suddenly found, 27 years ago, in the University library at Würzburg (Bavaria) a manuscript of the 5th or 6th century containing 11 treatises of the old heretic perfectly intact—the genuineness of which

¹ Comp. Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, xxiv, 311.

cannot in the least be doubted. It must remain a riddle for us how this manuscript could be preserved without attention having been drawn to it. Nevertheless it is a matter of fact that these 11 treatises of Priscillian now, more than 1500 years after his death, can again be read; they were printed in the edition of the discoverer, Dr Georg Schepps, in 1889.

A similar fortune was prepared for Nestorius. A Syriac translation of his *Book of Heraclides* mentioned above, which was made about 540 A.D., is preserved in a manuscript, dating from about 1100, in the library of the Nestorian Patriarch at Kotschanes in Persian Turkestan. The American missionaries in the neighbourhood of the Urmia Lake having heard about this manuscript, attempted to gain further information about it, and in 1889 a Syrian priest, by name Auscha'nâ, succeeded in making secretly a hurried copy of the manuscript for the library of the missionaries at Urmia. One copy of this Urmia copy came into the University library of Strassburg, another into the possession of Professor Bethune-Baker of Cambridge; a fourth copy has been made directly after the original at Kotschanes for the use of the Roman Catholic editor, the well-known Syriac scholar Paul Bedjan.

The rediscovery of this work of Nestorius was first made known when the existence of the Strassburg manuscript was heard of, in 1897¹. The publication of

¹ Comp. my *Nestoriana*, p. 4.

the Syriac text was delayed longer than scholars seemed to have had a right to hope. The first detailed notice of the work, therefore, was given by Professor Bethune-Baker in his work, *Nestorius and his teaching*, edited 1908. This scholar had been enabled by means of an English translation of a friend to make use of the *Book of Heraclides* or "Bazaar of Heraclides" as he called it. Long quotations from the book of Nestorius made this publication of great value. As late as 1910 the edition of the Syriac text by Paul Bedjan appeared and at the same time a French translation by F. Nau¹. It is especially this publication which is able at the present time to arouse interest in Nestorius.

First the preface of the Syriac translator attracts our attention. The translator remarks at the conclusion that the following book of Nestorius belongs to the controversial writings on the faith and must be read after the "Theopaschites" and the "Tragedy", which he wrote as apologetic answers to those who had blamed him for having demanded a council². This remark not only confirms what we already knew from Evagrius about the *Tragedy* of Nestorius, but it enables us also to identify the second book of the banished Nestorius known to Evagrius. Evagrius tells us that it was directed against a certain Egyptian—Cyril is often

¹ *Nestorius, Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas*, ed. P. Bedjan, Paris, 1910; *Nestorius, Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas, traduit en Français par F. Nau*, Paris, 1910.

² Bedjan, p. 4; Nau, p. 3.

called by Nestorius “the Egyptian”—and that it was written $\deltaιaλεκτικως^1$, apparently meaning “in the form of a dialogue”. These words of Evagrius even before the discovery of the *Book of Heraclides* could be held to point to the *Theopaschites*, which has in the fragments that are preserved the dialogue form. Nevertheless in my *Nestoriana* I did not venture to make this identification because the book known to Evagrius must have also contained historical-polemical passages, while the fragments we have present no such material. Now according to the preface of the translator of the *Book of Heraclides* the *Theopaschites* really contained historical-polemical material. One can therefore now without doubt identify it with the second book notified by Evagrius.

More interesting than the preface is naturally the book itself. Its title, “*Tegurtâ*” of *Heraclides of Damascus*, according to Bedjan² and Nau³ corresponding in Greek to $\Pi\rhoa\gammaμaτeίa$ ‘ $\mathcal{H}ρaκλeίdou$ τou $\Delta aμaσkηnou$ ’, hence “Treatise of Heraclides”—not “Bazaar of Heraclides” as Professor Bethune-Baker translated—is the most puzzling thing in the whole work. The Syriac translator remarks in his preface that Heraclides was a noble and educated man living in the neighbourhood of Damascus, and that Nestorius puts this name in the title of his book because he feared

¹ h. e. 1, 7, pp. 13, 21: $\gamma\rho\acute{a}φei$ $\delta\acute{e}$ $κa\iota$ $\mathfrak{\acute{e}t}e\acute{e}rōn$ $\lambda\acute{o}γoν$ $\pi\rho\acute{o}s$ $\taui\acute{a}$ $\delta\acute{h}θe\acute{e}v$ $\Lambda\acute{e}γ\acute{u}pti\acute{o}n$ $\sigmauγke\acute{e}meu\acute{o}n$ $\kappa.t.\lambda.$

² p. viii, no. 2.

³ p. xvii and *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, xiv, 1909, pp. 208 f.

that his own name would prevent people from reading it¹. The Syriac translator therefore had already found the title *Treatise of Heraclides* in his Greek original. He does not seem to have known anything about the meaning of this title. The vague remarks he makes about Heraclides tell nothing more than anyone might guess without his help. The book itself in its present incomplete condition—about one-sixth of the whole is missing—nowhere explains the title, Heraclides not being mentioned at all. And Nestorius has made no effort to conceal his authorship. The names of the persons which, in the dialogue of the first part of the book, head the single portions of the text, viz. *Nestorius* and *Sophronius*, must, it is true, be regarded as later additions—just as the headings of the chapters. But the manner in which the matter is dealt with, especially in the second half of the book, reveals so clearly that Nestorius is the writer, that a pseudonym, as *Heraclides* or anyone else, could have deceived only those who gave no attention to the contents. Perhaps—that is the opinion of Bethune-Baker²—the pseudonymous title is to be regarded as the device of an adherent of Nestorius, to save his master's apology from destruction.

However it may be—the book itself has nothing to do with Heraclides of Damascus. It falls, as the Syriac translator rightly remarks³, into two parts, the first of

¹ Bedjan, p. 3; Nau, p. 3.

² *Nestorius and his teaching*, p. 33. ³ Bedjan, p. 4; Nau, p. 4.

which has three, the second two sections. To the first section of the first part¹ the translator gives the heading: *Of all heresies opposed to the church and of all the differences with regard to the faith of the 318* (i.e. the Fathers of Nicaea). In the second section² Nestorius, as the translator observes, *attacks Cyril and criticizes the judges* (who condemned him) *and the charges of Cyril*. The third section³ contains according to the translator *his* (viz. Nestorius') *answer* (or apology) *and a comparison of their letters* (viz. of Cyril and Nestorius). The first section of the second part⁴ is characterized by the translator as *a refutation and rectification of all charges for which he was excommunicated*, and the second section⁵ as dealing with the time or the events *from his excommunication to the close of his life*.

Even the first of the five sections shows considerable omissions; the second is incomplete in the beginning and again at the end; also of the third section the beginning is missing. The fourth section, in which all extracts from the sermons of Nestorius criticized at Ephesus as heretical are brought under review, seems, apart from small omissions, incomplete only in the

¹ Bedjan, pp. 10-13 f.; Nau, pp. 1-88; comp. Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, xxiv, 240, 44 ff.

² Bedjan, pp. 147-209; Nau, pp. 88-125.

³ Bedjan, pp. 209-270; Nau, pp. 126-163.

⁴ Bedjan, pp. 138-160 and 271-366 (or 459); Nau, pp. 163-235 (or 294); comp. Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, xxiv, 240, 55 f.

⁵ Bedjan, 366 (or 459)-521; Nau, 235 (or 294)-331.

beginning; the last section is the most completely preserved.

In spite of all omissions it is a book of extensive scope in which Nestorius speaks to us: the Syriac text has 521 pages, the French translation of Nau fills 331, and they are of a large size.

In reading the book one has to regret, it is true, again and again, that it has not been preserved intact and in its original language. It would be of inestimable importance for the history of Christian doctrine if we possessed the original Greek of these explanations, so important from a dogmatic point of view.

Nevertheless even as we have it now in the Syriac translation the *Treatise of Heraclides* of Nestorius remains one of the most interesting discoveries for students of ancient church history. In two respects it is able to awaken fresh interest in Nestorius: by what we hear about his life and by what we learn about his doctrine.

As concerning the first, the *Treatise of Heraclides* has undoubtedly many relations to that earlier work of Nestorius, entitled *Tragedy* and only known in a few fragments, in which he treated historically and polemically the tragedy of his life and especially the doings of the Cyrilian council of Ephesus. Also in the *Treatise of Heraclides* Nestorius writes as one who is conscious of being unjustly condemned and wrongly delivered over to the intrigues of the unscrupulous

Cyril. But he does not make pretentious claims for his person or hope for another turn of his fortune. He has no more interest in the world. For *e.g.* after having said that one might ask him why the bishops of the Antiochian party had given assent to his deposition he answers¹: *Well you must ask him* (meaning Cyril), *apparently also those* (meaning the Antiochians). *If you want to learn anything else of me, then I will speak of what is now gradually coming to the knowledge of the whole world, not in order to find approbation or assistance among men—for earthly things have but little interest for me. I have died to the world and live for Him, to whom my life belongs;—but I will speak to those who took offence etc.* He writes in exile in the deserts of Egypt and has no prospect but of death. *As for me, so he concludes the treatise², I have borne the sufferings of my life and all that has befallen me in this world as the sufferings of a single day; and I have not changed all these years. And now I am already on the point to depart, and daily I pray to God to dismiss me—me whose eyes have seen his salvation. Farewell Desert, my friend, mine upbringer and my place of sojourning, and thou Exile, my mother, who after my death shalt keep my body until the resurrection comes in the time of God's pleasure! Amen.*

We knew previously that Nestorius had to endure

¹ Bedjan, p. 451; Nau, p. 289.

² Bedjan, p. 520 f.; Nau, p. 331.

many sufferings during his exile. Evagrius, as I said above, hands down to us fragments of two letters of Nestorius to the governor of Thebais¹. From these we learn that Nestorius was captured in Oasis by invading bands of barbarians and then, being released, surrendered himself, by a letter written in Panopolis, into the hands of the governor, in order not to come under the suspicion of having fled. But then, so the second letter teaches us, he was sent by order of the governor first to Elephantine and, before reaching it, back to Panopolis, then into the surrounding district and from there to a fourth place of exile. The hardships of these continual removals and severe bodily pains caused by an injured hand and side had brought him to the brink of death. We cannot help being moved when we see him in his first letter from Panopolis, written directly after his release from capture, asking the governor that he should see to a lawful continuation of his exile, *lest in all future generations should be told the tragic history that it was better to be captured by barbarians than to take refuge with the Roman Empire*². But these occurrences happened soon after 435, for in the first letter Nestorius mentions the synod of Ephesus as a fact of the recent past. Scholars therefore could suppose and actually

¹ Evagrius, h. e. 1, 7, pp. 14-16; *Nestoriana*, pp. 198-201.

² ἵνα μὴ πάσαις ἐκ τούτου γενεῖσθαι τραγῳδῆται κρείττον εἶναι βαρβάρων αἰχμάλωτον ἢ πρόσφυγα βασιλείας, ῥωμαϊκῆς (Evagrius, 1, 7, p. 15, 12 f.; *Nestoriana*, p. 199, 12 ff.).

did suppose that death soon put an end to the sufferings of the banished Nestorius. He feels himself an old man even as early as the time of these letters.

But now the *Treatise of Heraclides* teaches us that Nestorius was still alive at least in the autumn of 450, for the news of the death of the Emperor Theodosius, who died 28 July 450, had penetrated even to the loneliness of his exile. Professor Bethune-Baker¹ goes even further, thinking—in my opinion without sufficient grounds—that Nestorius must have died after the council of Chalcedon, about 452. During at least 15 to 16 years, therefore, Nestorius endured the hardships of exile. How many sufferings these years may have seen! Nestorius does not speak much of them. But he remarks incidentally, that *for many years he never had a moment of repose or any human comfort*². Surely the person claims our interest who in spite of all this could write³: *The goal of my earnest wish, then, is that God may be blessed on earth as in heaven. But as for Nestorius,—let him be anathema! Only let them say of God what I pray that they should say. I am prepared to endure and to suffer all for Him. And would God that all men by anathematizing me might attain to a reconciliation with God.*

¹ *Nestorius and his teaching*, pp. 34–37, and *Journal of theol. studies*, ix, 1908, pp. 601–605.

² Bedjan, p. 519; Nau, p. 330.

³ Bedjan, p. 507 f.; Nau, p. 323.

Thus, if we are interested by what the *Treatise of Heraclides* teaches us about the life of Nestorius, in no less a degree ought our interest to be awakened by what we learn about his doctrine.

As early as about 440 Socrates the church-historian defended, with the impartiality which distinguished him, his contemporary Nestorius against the grave misrepresentation to which his doctrine was exposed. People, as he says¹, thought that Nestorius regarded the Lord as a mere human being, as did Paul of Samosata and Photinus. *But*, so he continues², *I read his writings and I will say the truth: he did not hold the same opinions as Paul of Samosata and Photinus nor did he at all regard the Lord as a mere man, only he abhorred the term θεοτόκος as a bugbear.*

In a still higher degree Luther did justice to Nestorius. In his book *Von Conciliis und Kirchen* he confesses that he himself for some time did not understand what the error of Nestorius was, and that he also thought that Nestorius had held Christ to be nothing more than a man, as the popish decrees and all popish writers declared; but that after having looked more accurately at the accounts he saw that this was false³. This, too, according to Luther, was wrongly assumed about Nestorius, that he made two persons of the one Christ. *Nestorius*, Luther says, *really does not teach more*

¹ h. e. 7, 32, 6.

² l.c. 8.

³ *Erlanger Ausgabe, Deutsche Schriften*, 2. Aufl. 25, 364.

than one Christ ; hence he could not regard Christ as two persons ; otherwise he would have said a Yes and a No in the same article, contradicting himself¹. Nestorius, he says², rightly believed that Christ was God begotten of the Father from all eternity and man born of Mary the Virgin ; and, he declares³, it was right, too, that Mary did not bear the Godhead. But Luther thought that Nestorius as a rough and unlearned man did not comprehend the *communicatio idiomatum*, which in his opinion justifies the phrase that God was born of Mary, just as a mother (although the soul of her child does not come from her) is nevertheless not only the mother of the body, but the mother of the child⁴.

Luther had but a very limited knowledge about Nestorius. To the increased knowledge of our day even before the discovery of the *Treatise of Heraclides* the doctrine of Nestorius showed itself in a still more favourable light. As early as ten years ago I wrote in the *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* : *If Nestorius had lived in the time of the council of Chalcedon, he would possibly have become a pillar of orthodoxy*⁵. Now the *Treatise of Heraclides* teaches us that Nestorius lived roughly speaking till the time of that council. Accurately speaking there is no trace of the Chalcedonian synod in the *Treatise of Heraclides*, and the passages which seem to point to the time following it

¹ l.c. p. 365.

² l.c. p. 366.

³ l.c. p. 367.

⁴ l.c. p. 367.

⁵ XIII, 741, 15 f.

must in my opinion be explained otherwise¹. Hence I believe that the monophysitic stories asserting that Nestorius had been invited to the council of Chalcedon, but died a dreadful death on the journey thither² are right in so far that Nestorius did not live to see the opening of the council in October 451. But he saw the beginning of the reaction which followed the so-called robber-synod of Ephesus in 449. He even read the famous letter of Pope Leo to Flavian of Constantinople, which was of such decisive importance for the determination of Chalcedon and was acknowledged as a norm of doctrine by this council. What was his judgment about this letter of Leo's? Many times in the *Treatise of Heraclides* he declares that Leo and Flavian taught the truth and that their opinion was exactly the same as his³. He even tells that he was begged by friends to write to Leo of Rome, but he did not do it, lest—so he says—through the prejudice existing against him he should hinder him (*i.e.* Leo) who was running a right course⁴.

Because of all this, Professor Bethune-Baker, in his above-mentioned book, *Nestorius and his teaching*,

¹ Comp. Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, xxiv, 241, 36 ff.

² Comp. F. Nau, *Nestorius d'après les sources orientales*, Paris, 1911, p. 51 ff.; Evagrius, h. e. 2, 2, ed. Bidez and Parmentier, p. 39, 17 ff.

³ Bedjan, pp. 466, 474, 495, 514, 519; Nau, pp. 298, 303, 316, 327, 330.

⁴ Bedjan, p. 519; Nau, p. 330.

thought he could maintain on the ground of the *Treatise of Heraclides* that Nestorius was not a Nestorian but was perfectly orthodox¹. This thesis and the *Treatise of Heraclides* on which it is based are indeed both able to awaken our interest in Nestorius.

And still a third factor capable of arousing our interest besides my *Nestoriana* and the *Treatise of Heraclides* must be named. The French translator of the *Treatise of Heraclides*, F. Nau, has added to his translation four further almost new *Nestoriana*. He thinks he has discovered the original Greek text of three sermons of Nestorius on the story of the temptation, of which I knew only fragments from the first and third². I had grounds for supposing that more of these sermons existed in manuscripts of Chrysostomus, but I did not succeed in finding such material³. The new discovery, I fear, is looked upon in a too optimistic manner by its editor. The new sermons certainly contain actual sections of homilies of Nestorius; but taken as a whole they do not seem to me to be of a really different kind from that Pseudo-Chrysostomus-homily from which I took the fragments of the sermons on the story of the temptation. Hence I cannot believe that the new sermons present the homilies of Nestorius on the temptation in an unaltered and complete form⁴.

¹ pp. vii and 197 ff.

² Nau, pp. 333-358; *Nestoriana*, pp. 341-347.

³ *Nestoriana*, p. 149.

⁴ Comp. Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, xxiv, 242, 29 ff.

More interesting, therefore, in my opinion, is the fourth *Ineditum* which Nau gives in a French translation, after a Syrian British Museum manuscript to which I pointed in my *Nestoriana*¹. I refer to a fragment of a letter of Nestorius to the inhabitants of Constantinople, the beginning and end of which were previously known by a quotation made by the Monophysite Philoxenus of Mabug². I did not include this letter in my *Nestoriana*, because with all other scholars I regarded it as a monophysitic forgery intended to discredit the doctrine of Pope Leo by showing it to be approved by Nestorius. Indeed the letter appears for the first time in monophysitic circles—in the writings of Philoxenus about 520² and, what escaped the notice of Nau, about 570 in the so-called anonymous *Historia miscellanea*³. But according to the Syrian translator⁴ the Nestorians also, e.g. Simon Bar Tabbahê about 750⁵; acknowledged it as genuine, and since we know from the *Treatise of Heraclides* the judgment of Nestorius about Flavian and Leo there is no longer a plausible objection which may be raised from this side against the genuineness of the letter. I confess, however, that I am not rid of all doubts. Certainly a definite judgment is not possible till the whole of the letter be brought to

¹ p. 84.

² Comp. *Nestoriana*, p. 70.

³ *Die Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor in deutscher Übersetzung* von K. Ahrens und G. Krüger, Leipzig, 1899, pp. 23, 31 ff.

⁴ Nau, p. 376.

⁵ Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientales*, III, 215.

light; for now between the beginning quoted by Philoxenus and the fragment of the British Museum a section is missing, the length of which we do not know. Nevertheless the genuineness of the letter seems to me now to be more probable than the contrary¹.

The beginning of the letter refers to the synod of Constantinople, held in 448 by Flavian for the purpose of condemning Eutyches, and the criticism of his doctrine given by Leo in his letter to Flavian. *It is my doctrine, so Nestorius declares, which Leo and Flavian are upholding*². Then, after the omissions, some assertions corresponding to the doctrine of Nestorius only as described by Cyril, are disproved. Then follow polemics against Cyril, rejecting various quotations from the Fathers which he was in the habit of using in supporting his doctrine, these quotations being for the most part apollinaristic forgeries³. Then the letter ends in exhortations. These conclude with the words preserved also by Philoxenus: *Believe as our holy comrades in the faith, Leo and Flavian! Pray that a general council be gathered in order that my doctrine, i.e. the doctrine of all orthodox Christians, be confirmed. My hope is, that when the first has taken place, the second, too, will come to pass*⁴. Here Nestorius is wooing the interest of his readers for the council of

¹ Comp. note 3.

² Nau, p. 374; 1, 3.

³ This fact evidently is in favour of the genuineness of the letter.

⁴ Nau, p. 375; III, 19.

Chalcedon before it was held. Was his doctrine really in harmony with that of this council? Was this heretic a rudely maltreated exponent of orthodoxy?

These questions, you see, are not only raised by Professor Bethune-Baker; but we, too, have to raise them, when we are considering the material we find in the sources.

Hence I hope that, while dealing with these questions, I shall succeed in gaining your further interest during the course of the next three lectures.

In the next lecture we shall see that really to no other heretic has been done such great injustice as to Nestorius. The last two lectures will deal with the doctrine of Nestorius and his position in the history of dogma.

II

IN the preceding lecture we saw that by the increased knowledge of the works of Nestorius and especially by his lately rediscovered *Treatise of Heraclides*, written not long before his death, and by his still later letter to the inhabitants of Constantinople, the question is raised whether this heretic was a rudely maltreated exponent of orthodoxy.

About his doctrine we shall speak in the next lecture, to-day it will only occasionally be mentioned. For what now will occupy us is the fact that he was

indeed so rudely maltreated that his life really became what he himself called it—a *tragedy*. This tragedy is composed of five acts: first the undivided affection of his parish was robbed from him, then the sympathies of the Occident, then the favour of the court and his episcopal office; then he was brought into disfavour as a heretic also amongst the majority of his friends, and finally as an exiled and forgotten man he was exposed to common condemnation.

1

It is well known that Nestorius in April 428 was called out of the monastery of Euprepios, in the neighbourhood of Antioch, to the vacant bishopric of Constantinople¹. We knew before the discovery of the *Treatise of Heraclides* that it was the aversion of the court to the election of a Constantinopolitan which caused the decision to be in his favour². Now we are told more about this by an address which Nestorius in his *Treatise of Heraclides* puts into the mouth of the Emperor Theodosius³. Of course this address cannot be regarded as given by the Emperor in these very words; but it is certainly trustworthy in what it tells about the events in Constantinople. We see here that the sentiment of the court was the result of lengthy

¹ Comp. Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, XIII, 737, 45 ff.

² I.e. p. 737, 37 ff.

³ Bedjan, p. 377 ff.; Nau, p. 242 ff.; comp. Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his teaching*, p. 6 ff. note 3.

transactions, in which the emperor made great concessions to the monkish party and its leader, the archimandrite Dalmatius. The monks themselves, according to the narration of Nestorius, finally asked for the decision of the court¹. They, too,—later the most embittered enemies of Nestorius—had at first no ground for being discontented with his election. And, apart from the heretical parties, which experienced the anti-heretical zeal of the new bishop soon after his enthronement², this contentment was at first general³.

But already before the end of Nestorius' first year of office, the controversy began. Nestorius asserts in the *Treatise of Heraclides* in just the same manner as in a letter of December 430 to John of Antioch and in his *Tragedy*, that he was not its beginner—he had found a quarrel over the question as to whether Mary was to be called *θεοτόκος* or *ἀνθρωποτόκος*, when he arrived at Constantinople, and in order to settle it, he had suggested the term *χριστοτόκος*⁴. When did Nestorius do this? I think it was common opinion that it took place in his “first sermon on the *θεοτόκος*,” which dates perhaps as far back as 428, perhaps only from the beginning of 429. But in the fragments of this sermon⁵

¹ Bedjan, p. 379; Nau, p. 243 f.; Bethune-Baker, p. 8, note.

² Comp. Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, XIII, 738, 1 ff.

³ I.c. p. 737, 53 ff.

⁴ Bedjan, p. 151; Nau, p. 91; ep. ad Joann., *Nestoriana*, p. 185, *Tragoedia*, *Nestoriana*, p. 203.

⁵ *Nestoriana*, pp. 249–264; comp. pp. 134–146.

the term *χριστοτόκος* does not occur. Now Nestorius in his *Treatise of Heracles* tells us that the quarrelling parties, which abusively designated each other by the names of "Manicheans" and "Photinians", came into the bishop's palace and begged his counsel. He recognised that neither the friends of the *θεοτόκος* were Manicheans nor were the upholders of the term *ἀνθρωποτόκος* adherents of the heresy of Photinus, and he declared that both terms, when rightly understood, were not heretical, but as a safer one he suggested the term *χριστοτόκος*¹. In this way, Nestorius narrates, the parties were reconciled, and they were at peace with one another until Cyril of Alexandria intruded himself in the matter².

In this account, three points are worthy of consideration. First the notice that Nestorius advised the quarrelling parties in his home. This report is undoubtedly trustworthy, for in his first sermon on the *θεοτόκος* Nestorius directly makes mention of such persons, who shortly before in his presence argued against each other the question whether Mary should be called *θεοτόκος* or *ἀνθρωποτόκος*³. This extension of our knowledge as regards the place where Nestorius advised the contending parties seems to be very unimportant. But that this is not the case we shall now

¹ Bedjan, p. 151 f.; Nau, p. 91 f. ² I.c. pp. 152 and 92.

³ Nestorian, p. 251, 21 ff.: *Audiant haec, qui..., sicut modo cognovimus, in (ex?) noīis invicem frequenter sciscitantur: θεοτόκος... Maria, an autem ἀνθρωποτόκος?*

see, if we discuss the second point which in the above-quoted narration of the *Treatise of Heraclides* seems to be worthy of consideration.

Nestorius, as I mentioned, says here he had declared that both terms, *θεοτόκος* as well as *ἀνθρωποτόκος*, rightly understood, were not heretical, but that he recommended as more safe the term *χριστοτόκος*¹. This account of Nestorius seems to be untrustworthy ; for his well-known first sermon on the *θεοτόκος*, preserved in long fragments², seems wholly to exclude the term *θεοτόκος* ; and it is likewise well known that Nestorius was continually reproached for interdicting or at least refusing to give to Mary the title *θεοτόκος*³. Even his afterwards unfaithful friend, John of Antioch, asked him in a letter of the autumn of 430 to give up his opposition against this designation of Mary⁴. Is Nestorius, therefore, telling a falsehood when he narrates that he had declared the *θεοτόκος*, when rightly understood, to be non-heretical ? Here the place of meeting between Nestorius and the quarrelling parties becomes important. For, while I do not believe that Nestorius even in his first sermon on the *θεοτόκος*, in spite of his criticism, declared the term to be nevertheless tolerable, yet it is not quite improbable that he did so previously in the

¹ Comp. above, p. 29.

² Comp. above, p. 28, note 5.

³ Comp. sermo 18, *Nestoriana*, p. 300, 15 : *Non dicit, inquit, τὸ θεοτόκος, et hoc est totum, quod nostris sensibus ab illis opponitur.*

⁴ Mansi, iv, 1065 B.

presence of the contending parties. This would agree with what he narrated as early as December 430 in his answer to the above-mentioned letter of John of Antioch¹. And even in his first letter to Pope Celestine, after having expressed his strong aversion to the term *θεοτόκος*, he nevertheless wrote: *The term may be tolerated*². Hence we can give credit to the statement of Nestorius, that from the beginning he did not regard as intolerable the term *θεοτόκος* if rightly understood. His position was this: he feared the term would originate false ideas³, and for this reason and because he believed the term unknown to the orthodox Fathers of the past, he had nothing in its favour and undoubtedly opposed it on frequent occasions; but even in a sermon of the spring of 429, which was known to Cyril before writing his *epistola dogmatica*, he declared: *If you will use the term θεοτόκος with simple faith, it is not my custom to grudge it you*⁴. Afterwards in a sermon, which cannot be dated, but was certainly delivered before the spring of 430, he was able to say: *I have already repeatedly declared that if any one of you or any one else be simple and has a preference for the term θεοτόκος, then I have*

¹ *Nestorian*, p. 185, 10 f.: *volentibus concessi, ut pie genitricen vel particen dei virginem nominarent.*

² l.c. p. 167, 24: *ferri tamen potest hoc vocabulum.*

³ *Sermo 10, Nestorian*, p. 273, 4 f.: *τὴν τῆς λέξεως προφορὰν ἀσφαλίζομαι, τὸν ἐν τῇ λέξει κρυπτόμενον κίνδυνον ὑφορώμενος.*

⁴ l.c. p. 272, 13 f.: *εἰ μετὰ πίστεως ἀπλῆς τὸ “θεοτόκος” προέφερες, οὐκ ἂν σοι τῆς λέξεως ἐφθόνησα.*

*nothing to say against it—only do not make a Goddess of the virgin*¹. And even before the letter of John of Antioch mentioned above Nestorius came to an understanding with his clergy about the necessary use and meaning of the term *θεοτόκος*².

How under these circumstances was such a passionate controversy as that which followed, possible? What was it that deprived Nestorius of the undivided affection of his parish which he enjoyed at the beginning?

First it may be noted that the enemies of Nestorius were persuaded that bad heresies lurked behind his opposition to the term *θεοτόκος*. As early as the spring of 429 Eusebius, afterwards bishop of Dorylaeum, accused Nestorius by means of a public placard of thinking as Paul of Samosata³. Even at that time Nestorius was reproached for regarding Jesus as a mere man⁴. This reproach however was still more groundless than the indignation about his opposition to the term *θεοτόκος*. Hence this reproach, too, cannot be the first and the true cause of the controversy.

Nestorius declares in the above-quoted passage of the *Treatise of Heraclides*—and this is the third point

¹ *Nestoriana*, p. 353, 17 ff.: Εἶπον δὲ ἡδη πλειστάκις, ὅτι εἴ τις ἦ
ἐν ὑμῖν ἀφελέστερος, εἴτε ἐν ἄλλοις τινὶ χαίρει τῇ τοῦ “θεοτόκος” φωνῇ,
ἔμοι πρὸς τὴν φωνὴν φθόνος οὐκ ἔστι. μόνον μὴ ποιείτω τὴν παρθένον
θεάν.

² ep. ad Joann. *Nestoriana*, p. 184, 21 ff.

³ Mansi, iv, 1008 ε–1012 β (Greek text) and v, 492–494 (Latin text); comp. *Nestoriana*, p. 49.

⁴ *Nestoriana*, p. 259, 16; 284, 2; 285, 12.

which in his statement needs explanation—that the real cause of the controversy is to be found in the intrigues of Cyril of Alexandria¹. These intrigues on their part, according to what Nestorius tells in the continuation of the above-quoted passage², originated in accusations which were brought against Cyril himself. Cyril is regarded by Nestorius as having framed the dogmatic controversy for no other reason than to keep these accusations in the background. Nestorius raised this reproach against Cyril as early as in the late summer of 430 in a letter to the bishop of Rome³; and that this reproach was well grounded, I tried to show as far back as 1903 by pointing to a letter, written by Cyril to his clerical agents in Constantinople⁴. After long explanations about the perverted doctrine of Nestorius he says in this letter: *I had till now no quarrel with him and wish him betterment; but for supporting my enemies he shall give answer before God. No wonder if the dirtiest persons of the city, Chairemon, Victor and others, speak ill of me. May he, who incites them, learn that I have no fears about a journey or about answering them. Often the providence of the Saviour brings it about that little things cause a synod to be held, through which His church is purified. But even if others and honourable men should accuse me on his instigation—that wretched*

¹ Comp. above, p. 29. ² Bedjan, p. 152 f.; Nau, p. 92.

³ ep. ad Caelest. 3, *Nestoriana*, p. 181, 10 f.

⁴ Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, XIII, 745, 30 ff.; comp. 743, 28 ff.

*man shall not hope that he can be my judge. I will withstand him, if I come thither, and it is he who shall answer for error*¹. Nevertheless Cyril says in a following section of this letter preserved only in its Latin text: *If he professes the right faith, then shall be made the most perfect and firmest peace. If he longs for that, let him compose an orthodox confession of faith and send it to Alexandria....Then I, too,...will publish a writing and declare that nobody shall reproach one of my fellow-bishops because his words—so I shall say—are rightly meant*². Does not this mean: If he does what I wish (pointing naturally and especially to the accusations, mention of which is cleverly omitted), then he is no heretic! To give you a full idea of the plottings of Cyril as shown by his communication with his agents I must add a further quotation from the letter which occupies us. It is out of the last part of the Greek text which by ancient scholars³ was held to be a supplement to the letter.

¹ Cyril, *ep. 10*, Migne, ser. graeca, 77, p. 65 D; comp. the Latin translation of Marius Mercator, ed. Baluze, p. 106=Migne, l.c. p. 74 f. It is noteworthy that Marius Mercator, a partisan of Cyril, suppressed the words ὁ δεῖλαος [μὴ προσδοκάτω]; he translates: *Non igitur speret*, etc. Veracity was not a common virtue among the Christians of that time!

² ed. Baluze, p. 108=Migne, l.c. p. 77 f.: *Si rectam fidem profiteatur, fiet plenaria et firmissima pax. Quam si in voto gerit, scribat catholicam fidem et mittat Alexandriam. Si haec ex affectu cordis intimi scribantur, paratus sum et ego pro viribus meis similia scribere et edere ac dicere, nullum debere gravari consacerdotum meorum, quia ejus voces, dicimus, habent intentionem ac propositum manifestum.*

³ Garnier in his edition of Marius Mercator, 1673, II, 56=Migne,

Cyril says here¹: *I received and read the petition you sent me, which, after having received my consent, is purposed for presentation to the Emperor. But since it contains various complaints against my brother there—or what shall I call him²?—I kept it back for the time, lest he should reproach you saying: you accused me as a heretic before the Emperor. But I composed another petition, in which I declined to be judged by him, pointing to his enmity and proposing that ...the judgment be handed over to other officials. Read this petition and present it, if need be. And if you see that he continues to scheme against me and really tries to set all things against me, write it to me at once. Then I shall choose some wary and prudent men and send them as soon as possible. For, as it is written³, I will not give sleep to mine eyes or slumber to mine eyelids till I have finished the fight for the salvation of all.*

Whoever knows this advice of Cyril to his agents cannot doubt that the accusations brought against Cyril played a prominent rôle in the beginnings of the Nestorian controversy, and will, therefore, put confidence in what Nestorius tells about this matter in his *Treatise of Heraclides*. The agents of Cyril, he narrates⁴,

l.c. p. 78; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, ed. of Venice, xiv, 755; Ch. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Kezereien*, v, 392, note 4.

¹ Migne, l.c. p. 68 c—69 A.

² κατὰ τοῦ ἐκεῖστε—ἢ ἀδελφοῦ ἢ πῶς ἀν εἴποιμι;

³ Psalm 132, 4.

⁴ Bedjan, p. 152 ff.; Nau, p. 92 f.

counselled the contending parties not to accept the term *χριστοτόκος*. They schemed, agitated and were to be found everywhere, referring always to Cyril as their ally. Then, according to Nestorius' narration, men who had complaints against Cyril, brought speakable and unspeakable things against him before the Emperor and requested at the same time that Nestorius should be judge. Nestorius then sent for Cyril's clerical agents and asked them to explain the situation. *But these*, to use Nestorius' own words, *were annoyed and said to me* : *What, you admit an accusation against the patriarch of Alexandria and do not at once condemn the accusers as calumniators without trial?... We contest your right and with good ground; for that would be a dangerous encouragement of accusers, while it will be a profit to you to keep him (Cyril) as your good friend and not to turn him, who is famous because of his importance and who is among the great, into an enemy.* *Then I answered them: I have no desire for a friendship which would make me guilty of injustice, but only for such which without respect of persons does God's work.* *Thereupon they returned: We will report it to the patriarch.* Since that time, continues Nestorius, *he became my irreconcilable enemy and ready for anything. He started a quarrel in order to decline my judgment on account of my enmity, and to outwit his accusers according to his custom, and to keep the charges, brought against him, in the background. This he managed to do, and then presented a petition*

asking that the judgment might be handed over to others¹. As evidence of this, Nestorius quoted the above-mentioned² conclusion of (or supplement to) Cyril's letter to his agents, adding a sharp criticism.

We do not know which were the charges made against Cyril before the emperor and before Nestorius —they do not seem to have been of a dogmatic kind; but, in my opinion, nobody can rightly dispute that they were of decisive importance for the dogmatic accusations which Cyril brought against Nestorius.

There is, however, one argument which could perhaps be advanced against this. Hefele, the Roman Catholic author of a famous history of the councils, objected³ that Cyril did not speak of the fact that his name was slandered by false accusers before his second letter to Nestorius, the so-called *epistola dogmatica*⁴, which was written about the end of January 430, while even his first letter⁵ to Nestorius contained the dogmatic charges against him. The observation seems at first to be right. For Cyril's letter to his agents, which we have discussed, is contemporary with his *epistola dogmatica* to Nestorius⁶, in spite of the differing tone of the two letters⁷. Nevertheless Cyril spoke of his being

¹ Bedjan, p. 153 f.; Nau, p. 93.

² p. 35.

³ C. J. v. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 2nd ed. II, 165 f.

⁴ ep. 4, Migne, 77, 44–49.

⁵ ep. 2, Migne, 77, 40 f.

⁶ Garnier, *opp. Marii Mercatoris*, II, 53.

⁷ Comp. ep. 4, Migne, 77, p. 48 D: *ταῦτα καὶ νῦν ἐξ ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ γράφω παρακαλῶν ὡς ἀδελφὸν κ.τ.λ.*; ep. 10, p. 68 A: *μὴ*

accused before his second letter to Nestorius and the contemporary letter to his agents. We learn this from the *Treatise of Heraclides*. We saw¹ that Nestorius here quoted and discussed the last part of Cyril's letter to his agents, which by ancient scholars was held to be a supplement to it; and the French translator of the *Treatise of Heraclides* really is of the opinion that Nestorius quoted only the mere conclusion of this letter². But in no words of Nestorius is there a hint that he deals with a part of a letter³. And more: if he had known the beautiful phrase which we found in a preceding section of the letter: *That wretched man shall not hope that he can be my judge* etc.⁴, he would not have passed it by. Hence he knew the "supplement" as a separate letter. That it really was one⁵ is confirmed by the translation of the letter to the agents made by Cyril's contemporary Marius Mercator; for in this translation the "supplement" is missing⁶. Then

προσδοκάτω δὲ ὁ δεῖλαος, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.; and 68 c: κατὰ τοῦ ἔκεῖσε—ἡ ἀδελφοῦ ἦ πῶς ἀν εἴποιμι; κ.τ.λ.

¹ Above, p. 34 f.

² Nau, p. 93, note 6.

³ Nestorius however omitted at least an introductory sentence; for the opening words of the "supplement": Τὸ δέ γε σχεδάριον κ.τ.λ. cannot have been the exordium of a letter.

⁴ Above, p. 34, note 1.

⁵ Comp. the restriction made above in note 3.

⁶ Baluze, p. 108. Garnier (II, 56), giving Peltan's (comp. *Nestorianiana*, p. 9 f.) Latin translation by the side of the Greek text, has induced some of his readers (e.g. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, v, 392, note 4, and, as it seems, also Migne, ser. gr. 77, p. 78) to take the Latin text as a translation of Mercator.

the question arises as to when the “supplement-letter,” so to speak, was written, and this question must be answered by the assertion that it was earlier than the letter to the agents as the conclusion of which it is found in the Greek manuscripts¹. For in the supplement-letter, Cyril, even writing to his own agents, is not yet sure whether he shall call Nestorius a brother or not, and he will not yet give Nestorius cause for the reproach that his agents denounced him as a heretic. The supplement-letter is written, therefore, at least as early as the first letter of Cyril to Nestorius, dating from about late summer 429. Nestorius in his *Treatise of Heraclides* seems to regard it as still earlier, for his

¹ About these manuscripts comp. *Nestoriana*, p. 8 ff. In the manuscripts used by Peltan in his translation (comp. *Sacrosancti... concilii Ephesini acta omnia Theodori Peltani...opera...latinitate donata*, Ingolstadt, 1576, p. 220) and by the *editio Commeliana* (Τὰ πρακτικὰ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς τρίτης συνόδου κ.τ.λ., 1591, p. 73), in the cod. Coislin. 32 (saec. XIII) of which Professor Henry Lebègue, of Paris, kindly has sent me a collation, in the codices Monacenses 115 and 116 (both saec. XVI; *Nestoriana*, p. 10, I gave erroneously the numbers 114 and 115) about which I received kind information from the Royal Library of Munich, and in the cod. Vat. 830 (saec. XV), as I learnt from a kind letter of Dr Erich Katterfeld, now at Rome, the “supplement” (*τὸ δέ γε σχεδάριον κ.τ.λ.*) immediately follows the preceding sentence (explicit: *εἰ μή τις γένηται μετάγνωσις*). But the Greek text given by these manuscripts proves itself to be very badly preserved, as is shown even by the address (*πρὸς τοὺς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κληρικὸν στασιάζοντας*); the Greek manuscripts cannot therefore give evidence against the hypothesis that the “supplement” originally was a separate letter or part of such. The Latin versions of the *Acta Ephesina* do not contain Cyril’s letter to his agents (comp. Mansi, V, 465 ff.).

narration gives the impression that the conversation between him and Cyril's agents took place some time before he received the first letter from Cyril¹. There are arguments against asserting that Nestorius was right in presuming this. I shall not lay any stress upon the fact that, according to Cyril's letter to pope Celestine², it was only the doctrine of Nestorius which gave him offence; for we have ground to distrust this holy man. And also the objection that the affair of the accusations against Cyril probably did not last a whole year or more, is not decisive. But it is certain that a reason for opposing the doctrine of Nestorius was to be found by Cyril in the party-difference between the Alexandrian and the Antiochian schools and in the rivalry between the sees of Alexandria and Constantinople. Cyril's letter to the Egyptian monks in which, about Easter 429, without mentioning Nestorius, he began to oppose his doctrine, really may have been brought forth by the party-difference alone. In Constantinople, too, in the very beginnings of Nestorius' time as bishop, there certainly were theologians and laymen who opposed his teaching for no other reason than because they were adherents of a different theological tradition. I leave, therefore, the question undecided as to whether the supplement-letter of Cyril to his agents was earlier than his first letter to Nestorius

¹ Comp. Bedjan, p. 157; Nau, p. 95.

² *ep.* 11, Migne, p. 89 ff.

or not. But it is certain that Cyril, who before writing his *epistola dogmatica* had knowledge of a sermon of Nestorius in which he allowed the use of the term *θεοτόκος*¹, could have come to an agreement with him as easily as with the Antiochians afterwards in 433², if he had not had, on account of the charges brought against himself, an interest in discrediting him. More than the heretic Nestorius, the “Saint” but really very unsaintly Cyril is to be held responsible for the Nestorian controversy. And it is not improbable that his agents in Constantinople were among those and behind those who aroused the first opposition against the teaching of Nestorius.

Nestorius was not quite guiltless, as he had been incautious in his polemics against the *θεοτόκος*. But it seems not to have been his fault that he made an enemy of Cyril. He, Cyril, the Saint, had the chief part in bringing it about that Nestorius lost the common confidence of his parish.

2

And Cyril did more. At about the same time that he wrote his *epistola dogmatica* he prepared for war against Nestorius. He composed his five books

¹ sermo 10, *Nestoriana*, pp. 265–277, which contains the passage quoted above, p. 31, note 4, is mentioned in Cyril's letter to his agents (*Nestoriana*, p. 264, 7) and this letter is contemporary with the *epistola dogmatica* (comp. above, p. 37, note 6).

² Comp. below, p. 53 f.

*adversus Nestorium*¹, a work which opposed and denounced as heretical 43 quotations from the sermons of Nestorius, which partly he had previously adapted to suit his polemical ends². Then he sent this work, translated into Latin, to the bishop of Rome together with a letter as untrue as it was clever³. About the same time he wrote three doctrinal letters really against Nestorius, but without mentioning his name, and addressed these to the emperor, to the empress and to the sister of the emperor, the “*Augusta*” Pulcheria⁴. With the first of these actions which opens the second act of our tragedy Cyril was astonishingly fortunate. I say *astonishingly fortunate*, for it is a riddle that Rome, whose dogmatic traditions were nearer to those of the Antiochians than to those of Cyril, let herself be guided by Cyril. In order to explain this riddle we can point to the fact that Rome had taken it amiss of Nestorius that he had received in Constantinople some banished western adherents of Pelagius⁵. One could even say that Rome took up her position against

¹ ed. Pusey, Oxford, 1875.

² Comp. Nestorius, *tragoedia, Nestoriana*, p. 205 ff. and *liber Heracl.* Nau, p. 222, note 2. ³ ep. 11, Migne, pp. 80-89.

⁴ Mansi, iv, 617-679; 679-802; 803-884=Migne, ser. graec. 76, 1133-1200; 1201-1336; 1336-1420; comp. Theodosius, *ad Cyrilum*, Mansi, iv, 1109 d, e.

⁵ Comp. Marius Merc. *exemplum commonitorii*, ed. Baluze, p. 132 f.; Nestorius, *ad Caelestium* (*Nestoriana*, p. 172 f.) and *ad Caelestinum*, ep. 1 (*ibid.* p. 165); Caelestin. *ad Nestorium*, Mansi, iv, 1034 b.

Nestorius before Cyril's action. For the seven books of Johannes Cassianus *contra Nestorium*, the writing of which was instigated by Rome, show no influence of the material sent by Cyril, as they deal only with three of the earliest Constantinopolitan sermons of Nestorius, evidently sent by Nestorius himself together with his first letter to pope Celestine¹. But the work of Cassianus itself is a riddle. Is it not monstrous to build up a strongly antinestorian work on this small basis of three sermons? This piece of monstrous daring cannot be explained unless it be that Rome was prejudiced against Nestorius. Is the reception of the Pelagians in Constantinople a sufficient ground for this prejudice? Hardly. For as regards these Pelagians Nestorius demanded advice of the Roman bishop in his very first letter². He would doubtless have sent them away if the pope had asked this. But Celestine of Rome had left unanswered at least three letters of Nestorius. The reason he afterwards gave, viz. that the letters of Nestorius had first to be translated into Latin³, deserves to be met by us with an incredulous shake of the head. Was the real reason perhaps plottings of Cyril? Cyril declares in May 430, in a letter to the pope, that he had not written before to any of his fellow-bishops about Nestorius⁴. As regarding the

¹ Comp. *Nestoriana*, pp. 51 f., 57, 156-158.

² *Nestoriana*, p. 166, 9 ff.

³ *ad Nestor. Mansi*, iv, 1026 D.

⁴ *ep. 11, 1, Migne*, 77, 80 c.

pope this must be true. But Cyril may have had his confidents also in Rome;—I believe him to have been capable of the most reckless intrigues. Indeed he says in the conclusion of his above-discussed supplement-letter to his agents: *The necessary letters will soon be written to the necessary persons*¹. However it may have been, at any rate it must be charged to Cyril that Celestine of Rome came to the firm conviction that Nestorius was a heretic. And in an astonishing degree the pope's actions followed the advice of Cyril. In a synod at Rome he condemned Nestorius and notified this, the 11th of August 430, to Cyril, to Nestorius, to John of Antioch and others, to whom he had been advised to write by Cyril². The letter to Nestorius was sent to Cyril for forwarding; it declared that Nestorius was to be regarded as excommunicated, if he did not recant within 10 days³. It is well known that Cyril made the best of the success he had had at Rome: he held a synod in Alexandria and wrote in its name his third letter to Nestorius, the so-called *epistola synodica*, which ends in the famous 12 anathematisms which Nestorius was to accept within 10 days on penalty of excommunication⁴. It was Sunday, the 6th of December 430, when this letter of

¹ *ep. 10*, Migne, 77, p. 69 A.

² Mansi, iv, 1018 ff.; comp. the marginal note, p. 1050 D and Cyril, *ep. 11*, 7 (*ad Caelest.*), Migne, 77, 85 A.

³ Mansi, iv, 1035 A B.

⁴ *ep. 17*, Migne, 77, 105–121.

Cyril together with that of the pope was delivered to Nestorius by an Alexandrian legation¹. Now there was an enmity not only between Nestorius and Cyril and his adherents, but also between him and the western division of the church.

Nestorius was not quite guiltless as regards this course of events. His behaviour towards the Pelagians had not been cautious, and the tone of his letters had perhaps displeased the pope. But it was tragic that there was a Cyril who was capable of turning the mistrust of Nestorius which previously existed in Rome into enmity.

3

In this case we find the turning point, as is usual, in the third act. The emperor, in spite of (or rather because of) the above-mentioned letters of Cyril, remained at first still inclined towards Nestorius². For it was Nestorius and no other who succeeded in inducing the emperor to call a new ecumenical synod³. On the 19th of November 430 the emperor ordered that it should be gathered together in Ephesus on Whitsunday next, *i.e.* the 7th of June 431⁴. To Cyril it was notified

¹ *Nestoriana*, p. 297, 25.

² Comp. Theodosius, *ad Cyrillum*, *Mansi*, iv, 1109 ff.

³ Comp. above, pp. 5 and 12, and Nestorius, *ad Caelest. ep.* 3 (*Nestoriana*, p. 182, 12).

⁴ *Mansi*, iv, 1111 ff.; Easter-day fell in 431, according to the Alexandrian Easter cycle, on the 19th of April (comp. E. Schwartz, *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln, Abhandlungen der Konigl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Neue Folge, viii, 6, 1905, p. 48).

also by a very ungracious imperial letter, which in the strongest terms required his appearance before this synodical court¹. Under these circumstances Nestorius could, on the 6th of December 430, receive with perfect composure the letters from Rome and Alexandria. The council would examine the matter, as he believed; and he looked forward to it without any fear. For he was convinced of the orthodoxy of his teaching, and the emperor was favourably inclined toward him; Cyril, on the contrary, was under suspicion for his doings and, as Nestorius with many others thought, also for his doctrine, and was out of favour with the emperor².

But Cyril was clever enough to change his position in Ephesus from that of anvil to that of hammer. Three things enabled him to do so. Firstly the great number of Egyptian bishops he had brought with him, secondly the support he found in Memnon the bishop of Ephesus and so in the population of that city, thirdly the effrontery with which he, who as having been accused ought to have remained in the background, pushed himself forward into a leading position³. Before the Antiochian bishops and the Roman legates had arrived he and his adherents opened the council on the 22nd of June⁴, though 15 days after the appointed

¹ Mansi, iv, 1109 f., comp. especially, p. 1112 c.

² Comp. his sermon of December 12th, *Nestoriana*, p. 299, 25 ff.

³ Comp. *liber Heraclidis*, Bedjan, p. 256 f.; Nau, p. 155.

⁴ X Cal. Jul., Mansi, iv, 1123 and v, 772 A.

time¹, nevertheless in an arbitrary manner. John of Antioch had, in a still existing letter written on the journey, given a prospect of his and his countrymen's arrival within 5 to 6 days², and this letter had arrived at Ephesus at the latest on the 20th of June³; 68 bishops on the 21st of June had protested against the opening of the synod before the arrival of the Antiochians⁴, and the commissioner, whom the emperor had sent to Ephesus, the count Candidian, emphatically demanded that the opening should be postponed⁵. But Cyril could not be hindered from making the best of the favourable situation. That Nestorius did not present himself before this party-council is comprehensible. They condemned him then *in absentia*⁶ and incited the people of Ephesus to tumultuous approbation of this judgment⁷. At the latest four days

¹ Comp. above, p. 45, note 4; Memnon (Mansi, iv, 1129 d) counts 16 days, including the first and the last day.

² Mansi, iv, 1121.

³ John's friends declared June 21st (comp. the next note): *juxta quae nuper suis litteris intimavit* (Mansi, v, 765 c). Cyril's lost letter to John of the 20th of June (Mansi, iv, 1272 c) seems to have been an answer to John's letter.

⁴ Mansi, v, 765-768 (*directa pridie quam celebrarentur gesta contra Nestorium*, i.e. XI Cal. Jul.=June 21; comp. Mansi, v, 765, note d).

⁵ Comp. his *contestatio* of June 22nd: *haec non semel sed saepius admonens... nihil profeci* (Mansi, v, 771 c).

⁶ Mansi, iv, 1211. It was in the first session of the Cyrillian council (June 22nd).

⁷ Mansi, iv, 1264 A B; comp. *Nestoriana*, 188, 19 ff.

after the opening of the Cyrillian council the Antiochians arrived¹, and, as they, too, on the 26th of June², probably the very day of their arrival³, opened with Nestorius and others the council or rather their party-council, and deposed Cyril and Memnon, there was, therefore, then, one party-council standing in opposition to the other. The Roman legates who arrived last of all joined the Cyrillian synod.

Now it was for the emperor to decide. After many transactions, which need not be described, induced by the demonstrating monks of Constantinople, he heard delegates of both parties⁴, and if not earlier at least then ceased to be a protector of Nestorius. Nestorius himself made this easier for the emperor by writing to Constantinople that he, if the right doctrine were sanctioned, would willingly renounce his bishopric and return to his monastery at Antioch⁵. Nevertheless the

¹ Hefele, 2nd ed. II, 192, note 2 (1875), left it undecided whether John arrived June 26th or the 27th; but even before the publication of the *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, I, 2, p. 24 (published 1873), it was to be seen in Mansi, V, 773 B, that the first session of the Antiochian council was held the 26th of June (VI Cal. Jul.).

² Comp. the preceding note.

³ This is pretended by the Cyrillian party (Mansi, IV, 1333 B); and the notice in the *Synodicon* (Mansi, V, 773 A; *Bibliotheca Casin.* I, 1, p. 58 A): *mox enim post triduum veniens Joannes*, probably confirms it, since the preceding document dates from June 23rd (Mansi, V, 772 C: *hesterno die*).

⁴ Hefele, II, 213 ff., 230 ff.; comp. now Nestorius, *liber Heraclidis*, Bedjan, p. 375 ff.; Nau, p. 241 ff.

⁵ *Nestorian*, p. 194, 16 ff.; comp. p. 195, note = Mansi, V, 792 f.

emperor when at about the end of July¹ he sent to Ephesus a second commissioner, the count John, one of his confidants, was not yet on Cyril's side: the royal order delivered by count John confirmed all three depositions, that of Nestorius, of Cyril and of Memnon², and when John committed all three into close custody, he consigned Nestorius to the care of count Candidianus, who was inclined towards him, while Cyril seems to have been treated in a less friendly manner³. The question of the doctrine was regarded by the court as still open; and as count John was not able to bring the parties at Ephesus to an understanding with one another, in the second half of August⁴ delegates of each group were called to the capital, or rather to the neighbouring city of Chalcedon, for further negotiations. But as regards the persons one decision was given just at this time: the emperor resolved about the end of August⁵ to send

¹ Hefele, II, 219, note 2.

² Mansi, IV, 1395 f.

³ Mansi, IV, 1398 B = V, 780 E; comp. *Liber Heraclidis*, Bedjan, p. 387 f.; Nau, p. 248 f.

⁴ A letter written by the Antiochian delegates immediately after their arrival at Chalcedon dates from *Gorpiae mensis undecimo*, (Mansi, V, 794 B = IV, 1406 E), i.e. according to Tillemont (edition of Venice, XIV, 776 f) the 4th or the 11th of September: and although each of these dates seems to me open to controversy (comp. Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie*, 2nd edition, VII, 1664), we can and must let the matter rest. Nearly the same time, as given by both dates, is indicated by the course of events.

⁵ Eight days before the letter mentioned in the preceding note was written (Mansi, V, 794 A).—The Alexandrian report in Mansi, V, 255 and 658 f., connecting the imperial order regarding Nestorius—

back Nestorius into his monastery. This resolve which was followed, though perhaps not instantly¹, by the return of Nestorius to Antioch, seemed regrettable to all Antiochians², but corresponded, as we saw, to the request of Nestorius. The emperor, however, did not order this because Nestorius had wished it. Nestorius was now in open disfavour; not even his name could be mentioned before the emperor³. But as for Cyril the situation had changed in his favour: he had been able to escape from custody and to return to Alexandria⁴, and as erroneously styling it an order of *banishment*—with the election of Maximian, which happened a month later, is not trustworthy (comp. *Tillemont*, xiv, 777 a).

¹ Nestorius, *ep.* 10 (*Nestoriana*, p. 195 f. = *Mansi*, v, 793), and the *epistola praefecti*, answered by this letter, seem to indicate a delay, and the Antiochians as late as in their answer to the second letter of their delegates (for the heading of chapter xxvi in *Mansi*, v, 794, belongs to chapter xxviii, comp. *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, i, 1, p. 60) apparently did not know anything about the departure of Nestorius, for they wrote only: *ea vero, quae contra personam, quae injustitiam pertulit, facta sunt, cognoscentes, totius obstuporis sumus taciturnitate perculti* (*Mansi*, v, 796 b).

² Comp. *epist. legat. orient.*, *Mansi*, v, 794 a b: ... *imperatori placuerit, dominum Nestorium ab Epheso dimitti, quocumque ire voluerit. Et omnino doluit anima nostra, quia, si hoc verum est, ea, quae absque judicio et illicite facta sunt, interim roborari videntur.*

³ Comp. *Theodoreti ep. ad Alex. Hieropol.*, *Mansi*, v, 800 b, and *epistola legatorum orientalium*, *Mansi*, iv, 1420 e (= v, 802 a).

⁴ That Cyril escaped from custody is told not only by Acacius of Beroea (*Mansi*, v, 819 c: *dum custodiretur in Epheso, fuga est usus*) and by Nestorius (*Liber Heraclidis*, Bedjan, p. 388; Nau, p. 249: *Cyrille...échappa à ceux qui le gardaient..., et gagna sa ville*); also the postscript given to the *ultima sacra imperatoris ad synodum* (*Mansi*, iv, 1465; v, 805) in the *Synodicon* (*Mansi*, v, 805) says:

successor to Nestorius a man was elected, Maximian by name, with whom he could be quite satisfied¹. And when the emperor, though no decision had been reached at Chalcedon, officially dissolved the council, Cyril's return to Alexandria was allowed and Memnon was permitted to remain in his office at Ephesus².

This change of feeling in the court is explained by Nestorius in a passage of his *Treatise of Heraclides* by the fact, as he thinks, that Cyril gave or promised much money to the count John and through him to the emperor³. He presumes, that the favour which John showed towards him was as unreal as his disfavour towards Cyril, as this disfavour only enabled him to let Cyril escape from custody⁴. The narration by which Nestorius tries to prove this assertion⁵ is very similar

missa sacra ultima omnium, directa est, quando jam redierat in civitatem suam beatus Cyrilus. Now this *sacra* was later than the consecration of Maximian which took place on the 25th of October (Socrates, 7, 37, 19; Mansi, v, 255 b=659 a: *post hoc*): the Alexandrian deputies of the Ephesian synod assisted at this consecration (Mansi, v, 255=658; Cyril, ep. 32, Migne, 77, 157 f.=Mansi, v, 265), and the Antiochian deputies, too, had not yet departed from Chalcedon, although they were not allowed to assist at Maximian's consecration (Acacius Beroe., Mansi, v, 819 cd). But Cyril arrived at Alexandria as early as October 30th (Mansi, v, 255 c=659 a); hence he left Ephesus before the council was dissolved.

¹ Comp. Cyril, ep. 32 (Migne, 77, 157 f.; Mansi, v, 265)

² Mansi, iv, 1765 b; v, 805 b.

³ Bedjan, p. 385 ff.; Nau, p. 247 ff.

⁴ Bedjan, p. 388; Nau, p. 249.

⁵ Bedjan, p. 385; Nau, p. 247 f.

to that which we find in a letter of Acacius of Beroea, written as early as 431¹. But in this letter it is the eunuch Scholasticus, not count John, who is bribed, and other differences, too, are to be observed. We see, therefore, that Nestorius is repeating party-gossip. Nevertheless there may be a foundation of truth in this gossip, for Nestorius and the Antiochians complain again and again—and, as we shall see, not without grounds—of the briberies of Cyril. In another place in his *Treatise of Heraclides* Nestorius tells us, that the *Augusta* Pulcheria supported Cyril, because he, Nestorius, offended her by not paying her, on account of doubts about her virtue, the ceremonial honours which she as a virgin demanded²; and in this narration the disfavour, which Nestorius had experienced at the hands of Pulcheria, cannot be an invention of the writer. Then it is interesting to note that Cyril in the beginnings of the controversy tried, as we saw³, to win Pulcheria to his cause, and afterwards, as we shall see⁴, sought her favour even by means of presents. But the endeavours of Cyril to gain favour with Pulcheria are only one example of his intrigues. More generally speaking it can be said: it was essentially Cyril's work, that the council of Ephesus, demanded by Nestorius

¹ *ad Alexandr. Hierop.*, Mansi, v, 819 c.

² Bedjan, p. 148; Nau, p. 89; comp. *ep. ad Cosmam*, Nau, p. 363, 8.

³ Above, p. 42.

⁴ Below, p. 55, note 3.

himself and hailed by him with joy, led to the result that Nestorius lost the emperor's favour and his bishopric. It was the tragedy of Nestorius' life, that, in Ephesus, the question was whether he should be overthrown or Cyril, a man as unscrupulous as he was greedy of power.

4

After the transactions at Ephesus the tragedy of Nestorius' life came to its end in two acts, the first of which is now to be treated. I say *after the transactions at Ephesus* and not *after the council of Ephesus*, for "a council of Ephesus," an ecumenical council of Ephesus, never existed. Two party-councils had sat and cursed each other; the dogmatic question had remained undecided. The Antiochians continued to hold Nestorius in esteem and to treat as heretical the anathematisms of Cyril; the latter, for his part, regarded Nestorius as a condemned heretic and had grounds for thinking that his council had proved his anathematisms¹. The church of the East was divided. The emperor, assisted by Maximian, the new bishop of Constantinople, forced the parties to a peace by means of the union of 433. The document of this union between Cyril and the Antiochians is Cyril's *epistola ad orientales*², in which he accepted an Antiochian confession of faith,

¹ Comp. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, edition of Venice, xiv, 398 and p. 758 (note 26).

² ep. 39, Migne, 77, 173-181.

composed in 431 at Ephesus, probably by Theodoret. The prolonged transactions which led to this union are even in their details sufficiently known to us. But I am glad not to have to treat them now; for the *Treatise of Heraclides*, although very often dealing with this union, adds nothing to our knowledge here, as far as I have been able to see.

I remark only, that Nestorius in his *Treatise of Heraclides* gives a sharp and right characterisation of the situation which preceded the union¹. Cyril and John of Antioch had each two wishes in the event of peace. Cyril wished to see acknowledged, firstly his council and the condemnation of Nestorius, secondly his anathematisms; John on the other side wished as ardently that the first should not take place and secondly, that Cyril should recant his anathematisms. Cyril, in order to retain his power, let himself be bartered down to a great extent. He accepted the Antiochian confession of faith and was contented with the fact that his anathematisms were not condemned. But he did not give up the demand, that his council should be acknowledged and Nestorius be anathematised. He again set in play all his possible means for attaining this end. And here we are in a position to follow his actions by means of documents, which show clearly that he did not even hold himself back from bribery. These documents are a letter of Cyril's archdeacon

¹ Bedjan, pp. 395-403; Nau, pp. 254-259.

Epiphanius to Maximian of Constantinople¹, and, supplementing it, a list of the presents which Cyril at the same time sent to Constantinople². I regret that time forbids me to quote this letter, but I beg every one who holds my judgment upon Cyril to be too harsh, to begin his study on the holiness of this man by reading this letter³. The aim of Cyril's intrigues and briberies

¹ *Mansi*, v, 987-989.

² *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, i, 2 (*Florilegium Casinense*), p. 46 f., comp. i, 1, p. 72.

³ Now in the printed text I am able to add some quotations, *Mansi*, v, 988 D:... *Nunc igitur, domine mi sanctissime, impone tibi omne in hac causa studium. Scriptum est a domino meo, fratre vestro, et dominae ancillae dei reverentissimae Pulcheriae et praeposito Paulo et Romano, cubiculario, et dominae Marcellae, cubiculariae, et dominae Droseriae, et directae sunt benedictiones dignae eis. Et ei, qui contra ecclesiam est, Chrysoreti praeposito, magnificentissimus Aristolaus paratus est scribere de nonnullis, quae angelus tuus* (read: *sanctitas tua=ἡ σὴ ἀγιότης?* comp. *Mansi*, note i) *debeat impetrare; et ipsi vero dignae transmissae sunt eulogiae* (comp. in the list of presents, *Bibl. Cas.* i, 2, p. 47 a: *Praeposito Chrysoreti, ut nos impugnare desinat, coacti sumus duplicita destinare*). *Scripsit autem dominus meus, frater vester, et domino Scholastico* (comp. *Bibl. Cas.* l.c. p. 47 b, and above, p. 52) *et magnificentissimo Arthebae, ut ipsi convenient et persuadeant Chrysoreti tandem desistere ab oppugnatione ecclesiae; et ipsis vero benedictiones dignae directae sunt. Festina igitur et tu ipse, sanctissime, supplicare dominae ancillae dei Pulcheriae Augustae, ut iterum ponat animam suam pro Domino Christo*—*puto enim, quod nunc non satis curet pro sanctissimo vestro fratre Cyrillo ut et omnes, qui sunt in palatio regis, et quicquid* (read: *quod aliquid?*) *avaritiae eorum deest, quanquam non desint et ipsi diversae benedictiones*—, *ut scribat increpative Joanni, quo nec memoria illius impii* (viz. *Nestorii*) *fiat. Scribatur vero et magnificentissimo Aristolao, ut instet ei* (viz. *Joanni*) *celeriter. Et roga dominam Olympiadem, ut*

shown by this letter was, that John of Antioch and his friends should be made willing to accept the judgment of his synod against Nestorius. John of Antioch yielded to Cyril at this point: to bring about the union he payed the heavy price of giving up his old friend. The same price was paid by almost all Antiochians who accepted the union, only Theodoret and a few others being excused from doing so.

From that time forth one could speak in ecclesiastical phraseology of *the holy ecumenical council of Ephesus*, which had condemned Nestorius. Nestorius could have accepted the confession of faith on which the union was based. It was, therefore, really tragic that the anathema against him was the price of the peace. He was now also robbed of his former friends, and there cannot be the least doubt that for this painful experience, too, he had to thank Saint Cyril.

et ipsa coadjuvet nos et ut insuper roget Marcellam et Droseriam, quia satis eam patienter auscultant... Et dominum meum sanctissimum Dalmatium abbatem roga, ut et imperatori mandet, terribili eum conjuratione constringens, et ut cubicularios omnes ita constringat, ne illius (viz. Nestorii) memoria ulterius fiat, et sanctum Eutychen, ut concertet pro nobis... Subjectus autem brevis (comp. above p. 55, note 2) ostendit, quibus hinc directae sint eulogiae, ut et ipse noveris, quantum pro tua sanctitate laboret Alexandrina ecclesia, quae tanta praestat his qui illic sunt; clerici enim, qui hic sunt, contristantur, quod ecclesia Alexandrina nudata sit hujus causa turbelae... De tua ecclesia praesta avaritiae quorum nosti, ne Alexandrinam ecclesiam contristent... Festinet autem sanctitas tua rogare dominam Pulcheriam, ut faciat dominum Lausum intrare et praepositum fieri, ut Chrysoretis (comp. above) potentia dissolvatur et sic dogma nostrum roboretur.

5

The last act of our tragedy may be treated shortly, but it stretches over a much longer period than any of the others. It was opened by the banishment of Nestorius to Oasis in the year 435¹, and not until sixteen years later was it closed by Nestorius' death².

We have only two accounts which give us information as to how this banishment of Nestorius came about. Nestorius himself, as we learn from Evagrius, narrated that for four years he had enjoyed at Antioch various tokens of esteem, but had then been banished to Oasis by order of Theodosius³. Evagrius adds that Nestorius did not say how fitting a measure this was, for also in Antioch Nestorius had not ceased his blasphemy, with the result that even Bishop John complained about it, and Nestorius was condemned to permanent exile⁴. The Nestorian legend, too, tells us that Nestorius had lived four years in Antioch and that then John of Antioch had caused his banishment out of jealousy of his influence⁵. That the first part of this account goes back to Nestorius' own narration is made probable by its concurrence with the words of Nestorius in Evagrius. It is, therefore, probable that also the

¹ Comp. below, note 3. ² Comp. above, p. 19 and 22.

³ Evagrius, *h. e.* 1, 7, ed. Bidez and Parmentier, p. 13, 12 ff.

⁴ *l. c.* p. 13, 16 ff.

⁵ M. Brière, *La légende syriaque de Nestorius* (*Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, 1910, p. 21; Nau, p. xxi, note 1).

account given about John of Antioch in both sources is derived from Nestorius. His banishment according to this account took place in the year 435¹. In the same year, on the 30th of July, Theodosius, the emperor, issued an edict which ordered the impious books of the detestable Nestorius against the orthodox piety and against the decrees of the synod of Ephesus to be burnt, and which gave the name of Simonians (that of an ancient heretical party) to his adherents². The wording of this edict and the account of Evagrius that Nestorius had not ceased his blasphemy in Antioch could make possible the conjecture³ that the banishment of Nestorius and this edict against his books were caused by what he had written in Antioch, especially by his *Tragedy* which dealt with the decrees of the synod of Ephesus. But this conjecture has its difficulties⁴. We are, therefore, obliged to take the edict as referring to the earlier books of Nestorius and the account of Evagrius to spoken blasphemies. All the more important in this connection must have been the instigatory efforts of John of Antioch. Pope Celestine, too, petitioned the emperor as early as 432 for the exile of Nestorius⁵, and Cyril was probably working with

¹ Four years after the synod of Ephesus, comp. above, p. 57, note 3.

² Mansi, v, 413 f.; *cod. Theodosianus*, 16, 5, 66.

³ *Nestoriana*, p. 88.

⁴ For according to Evagrius (l. c. p. 13, 15 f.) Nestorius mentioned in his *Tragedy* his banishment to Oasis.

⁵ Mansi, v, 271 B.

the same end in view. These latter are not much to be blamed for this wish. It is not the same with John of Antioch. He may have had, even if jealousy was out of the question, many grounds for finding the stay of Nestorius in Antioch disagreeable—his mere presence, after the union, was a reproach to him—but he has much impaired his good renown by this Judas-deed. And for Nestorius it was the consummation of his tragic fortune that his final banishment was caused by his former friend.

How rich the years of exile were in tragic events we have seen already in the first lecture¹. I merely remark here that Nestorius in these years was even before his death a dead man for the world—I mean the orthodox church. He now was nothing but the condemned heretic, nothing but the cause of offence thrust out from the people of God.

He was really not dead: he hailed with joy the change of the situation after the robber-synod, hailed with joy Leo's letter to Flavian, hailed with joy the new council he saw in prospect². He did not live to experience the fact that this council, too, condemned him and that also Theodoret, who even up to his death held to him, was forced to consent to this condemnation³. With this the tragedy of Nestorius' life came to an end. Now he was regarded by all in the church as a cursed heretic; now for him came to pass what,

¹ Above, p. 17 f. ² Comp. above, p. 25 f. ³ Mansi, vii, 188 f.

according to the edict of 435, was to be the fortune of his adherents: he had not only supported the punishment of being covered with ignominy during his lifetime, but also after his death did not escape from ignominy¹.

The orthodox saw in his sufferings nothing but a just penalty: Nestorius himself called his life a tragedy. I, too, used the same expression. But his life was a tragedy only if he was guiltless. The question as to whether he was guiltless shall occupy us in the next two lectures.

III

In the last lecture we spoke about the tragedy of the life of Nestorius. Was it really a *tragedy*? His enemies regarded his sufferings as deserved punishment for his impiety. Were they wrong? Was Nestorius really the guiltless victim of a tragic fortune? He was. It is this which I wish to prove in this and the next lecture.

I do not mean that Nestorius was altogether guiltless in his life's misfortune. He was incautious, passionate and reckless, and this, as we saw in the preceding lecture, was not without unfavourable influence upon the course

¹ Mansi, v, 413 b: μήτε ξῶντας τιμωρίας, μήτε θανόντας ἀτιμίας ἐκτὸς ὑπάρχειν.

of events. But no hero of a tragedy is quite guiltless. And we Christians know that we all have the old Adam in us as long as we live.

Only by understanding the word “guiltless” in a broader sense I am able to say that Nestorius was guiltless. His guilt was very slight in comparison with the heavy weight of his sufferings.

Socrates, the church historian, regarded, as we saw¹, the dogmatic charges against Nestorius as essentially unfounded. He thought the fault of Nestorius was his lack of knowledge². But I must decline to accept for Nestorius this *privilegium ignorantiae*. It is true that Nestorius at first did not know that the term *θεοτόκος* was used by some of the orthodox Fathers of the fourth century. But this lack of knowledge is not a sign of ignorance. I won’t say that Nestorius was a learned man. Neither the fragments of his works nor his *Treatise of Heraclides* show patristic or philosophical erudition. But his education was not in any way a merely rhetorical one. The *Treatise of Heraclides* and many of the earlier known fragments of Nestorius prove that, in spite of some inaccuracies in his terminology³, he was a theologian well educated in dogmatics.

Luther thought that, besides his want of learning, it was fatal for Nestorius that he was a boorish and proud

¹ Above, p. 20.

² *h. e.* 7, 32, 8: ἀγνοοῦντα ἐφευρίσκω τὸν ἄνδρα.

³ Comp. below, p. 90, note 1.

man¹. This judgment was based on a very insufficient knowledge of the sources. But it may give us occasion to enquire whether the personal character of Nestorius was the cause of his tragic fortune.

Nestorius was passionate and dogmatic. John of Antioch reminds him in a letter of a scene from their earlier life in common, which may prove this². And even an account, which is friendly to Nestorius, tells about him, that he was lacking in courtesy and amiability³. This characteristic is really shown in his letters to Cyril. Also his letters to Rome are not exactly models of courtesy. And even from the pulpit he sometimes declaimed against his enemies in a rough and passionate manner⁴.

The account, which denied him amiability, points in explanation of this characteristic to the fact that Nestorius, as a monk, had no experience of worldly affairs⁵. Indeed, it was an unpolished nature he showed. But the merits of this naturalness came out as clearly as the demerits. Even now we see something straight and open in the letters and in the polemics of Nestorius. And comparing his writings

¹ Comp. above, p. 21.

² Mansi, iv, 1064 D.

³ ep. ad Cosmam, Nau, p. 364, 9: *C'était un homme excellent et jalouxé, qui n'avait pas l'expérience des affaires du monde et qui manquait de ce qu'on appelle amabilité.*

⁴ In a sermon (*Nestoriana*, p. 300) he addressed Cyril: *Quid perturbationes ferinis rugitibus adferre conaris?*

⁵ Comp. above, note 3.

with those of Cyril, which overflow with so-called piety, and even with some of the letters of John of Antioch¹, we are agreeably impressed by observing that Nestorius did not wrap up his thoughts in pious phrases. It is also deserving of mention that Nestorius, where he had confidence, showed nothing of narrow-minded sensitiveness. His answer to the above-mentioned letter of John of Antioch is proof enough of this². I think he was also sincere when he asked Cyril the reproachful question: *Why did you not write me a friendly letter and inform me of the troubles in Egypt, their cause and the manner of settling them*, instead of writing to the monks about my doctrine³?

And it would be quite wrong to presume that Nestorius had also in his intellect something rough and blunt. He is, on the contrary, acute in his thinking, not without ability in his polemics, and here and there, by the use of fitting images, he shows that he was capable of fine observation⁴.

The reproach that he was proud is still less well grounded. He seems to have had an exalted idea of the bishop's position to which he was called⁵. This will

¹ Comp. *e.g.* his letter to Cyril, mentioned above p. 47, Mansi, IV, 1121. ² ep. vii, *Nestoriana*, pp. 163-186.

³ *Liber Heraclidis*, Bedjan, p. 158 f.; Nau, p. 96.

⁴ Comp. *Liber Heracl.*, Bedjan, p. 188, Nau, p. 113 (cuttles), B. p. 189=N. 114 (fights with children), p. 204=123 (timid dogs), p. 338=217 (drowsy men), p. 438=280 f. (wounded snakes).

⁵ I do not point here to the famous apostrophe, which, according

explain why he wrote to the Roman bishop with a self-conscious assurance and agreed without hesitation to become the judge of Cyril. But this self-consciousness of office was something other than pride and greed of power and glory. This is convincingly proved by the fact, that Nestorius himself offered the emperor to return to his monastery¹; and he did not only offer this, but he proved by the deed, that he *easily gave up his episcopal honours*². One cannot call him proud who regarded nothing more blissful than the calm stillness of the monastery³. And when in his exile he surrendered himself to the governor, as we saw⁴, he showed himself not only straightforward and honest, but also proved that he did not set a high value on himself and his life. Finally his remark that he did not write to Leo of Rome lest he should bring him into discredit⁵, may be taken as proof that striving after glory and honour and esteem was far from him.

May we now realise that, nevertheless, in the personal character of Nestorius are to be found the grounds for the tragic course of his life? It is intelligible to Socrates (7, 29, 4 f.), he gave to the king in his first sermon at Constantinople: Δός μοι, ὁ βασιλεῦ, καθαρὰν τὴν γῆν τῶν αἱρετικῶν, κάγγω σοι τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀντιδώσω. For here, I think, Nestorius is to be assumed as having spoken in the name of God.

¹ Comp. above, p. 48.

² Comp. *ep. ix, Nestoriana*, p. 194, 14 f.: *a me, teste deo, episcopalis honor facillime respuatur.*

³ l.c. p. 194, 22.

⁴ Above, p. 18.

⁵ Above, p. 22.

that a man with such characteristics was not exactly suited to the taste of the court and especially of the circle of that most pious lady, the *Augusta Pulcheria*; he was not cut out for a courtier. But even if the ground of his misfortune were to be found here, his life should nevertheless be called a tragedy, for his sufferings would have been too harsh a punishment. We can, however, hardly assume that the characteristics we discussed were the cause of Nestorius' unhappy fate. For he enjoyed the favour of the court as long as he lived in Constantinople and even longer, and his enemies never pretended, as far as I know, that his guilt rested in his personal character.

His enemies condemned him for his teaching. It is, therefore, his teaching that we must examine.

Nestorius was an Antiochian as regards his theological upbringing. I do not believe that he was a personal pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia—the chronology contradicts this, and there are no convincing arguments for this assumption¹. But that he was educated in the traditions of the Antiochian school is without doubt.

The Antiochian Christology is most easily comprehended, if we contrast it with Apollinarism, condemned by the church about fifty years before Nestorius became bishop of Constantinople. Apollinaris of Laodicea is well known to have taught that a real incarnation and a real unity of the historical person of Christ was

¹ Comp. Walch, *Ketzerhistorie* v, 315 f.

only intelligible, if the *Logos* took on himself not a perfect man, that is body and animal soul and intellectual soul or intellect, but joined himself with a human body and a human soul in such a manner that he himself became the intellect, the moving principle, in the new and united being. This idea of a substantial unity between the *Logos* and the human nature which resulted in the new and composite nature of the incarnate *Logos* seemed to the Antiochians to do away with the true manhood of Christ and with the possibility of his moral development. They taught, therefore, that the divine and the human nature in Christ were to be regarded as perfect each in itself, a human free will, too, having to be assumed in Christ. To maintain this, they laid stress on the assertion that the two natures in Christ were not altered by their union as substances which are chemically combined. Hence they did not think the union to be a substantial one.

Before going further I will make a short remark about the term *nature*, deferring discussion of the term *substance* till later. I can do it by quoting Professor Bethune-Baker. For this scholar is right in saying that the term *nature* at that time meant all the attributes or characteristics attached to a substance and as a whole always associated with it¹. Apollinaris saw in Christ but one substance, viz. the substance of

¹ Comp. Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his teaching*, p. 48.

the Logos, to which in addition to its own characteristics those of the imperfect human nature were attached.

Nestorius was as strong an opponent of this Apollinaristic doctrine as any other Antiochian. Regarding his zeal in opposing it, it is characteristic that he almost always named Apollinaris in the same breath with Arius and Eunomius or placed the Apollinarists and the Arians side by side¹. He had a right to do so; for the Arians were the first who looked at the incarnation, like Apollinaris, in a—I do not say *serious*—but mythical light. The pre-existent son of God, so was their teaching, really changed into man, taking the body from the virgin as his body so that he himself became the soul of this body and the subject of all experiences which are told of Jesus: he hungered, suffered, died. Hence the Arian Eudoxius expressly said that there were not in Christ two natures, the whole being one combined nature². Nestorius knew of course that Apollinaris, differing from the Arians, regarded the pre-existent Son of God, following the decree of the Nicene synod, as *όμοούσιος τῷ πατρί*, and, at least in the second period of his development,

¹ Comp. *Nestoriana*, p. 166, 19; 170, 30; 179, 4; 181, 18; 182, 8; 184, 15; 185, 12; 194, 16; 208, 16; 267, 16; 273, 6 f.; 300, 20; 301, 4. 5. 16; 305, 15 f.; 312, 7; *Liber Heracl.*, e.g. B. 252=N. 152; B. 261=N. 157.

² Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln*, 3rd edition, Breslau, 1897, § 191 p. 262: οὐ δύο φύσεις, ἐπεὶ μὴ τέλειος ἦν ἀνθρωπός, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ ψυχῆς θεὸς ἐν σαρκὶ· μία τὸ δλον κατὰ σύνθεσιν φύσις. Comp. Nestorius, *Liber Her.* B. 12=N. 6, 5.

conceded that this *λόγος* took on a human body with a soul¹; but he was right in minimising this difference. Here and there, he argued, the peculiar human nature of Christ became perfect only when the Logos was added to it, neither here nor there is Christ a real man as we²; and with acute perception he brings to light the weakness of Apollinaris' theory. Even if, he says, the incarnation was thought by Apollinaris to be a voluntary action of the *Logos*, nevertheless as soon as the unity between the *Logos* and the body with human soul was perfected, the union was after the manner of a substantial one, not voluntary: the *Logos* was forced *nolens volens* to suffer what his body and soul suffered³. And a second difficulty, too, is seen by Nestorius, a difficulty which afterwards gave trouble to the scholastics. If the Son, so Nestorius argues, was united substantially with the human nature, the same must be assumed also of the Father and the Holy Spirit because of the unity of substance in the Godhead, but if the Father and the Spirit had not, in the same measure as the Son, partaken in the sufferings of the historic Jesus, then the unity of substance with the Father and the Spirit is taken from the Son⁴.

But these difficulties of thinking are not the chief stumbling-block for Nestorius as regards the

¹ *Liber Her.* B. 50=N. 31.

² l.c. B. 50 f., 52 ff.=N. 31, 32 ff.

³ l.c. B. 55 f.=N. 35.

⁴ l.c. B. 56, 58=N. 35, 36.

Apollinaristic teaching. The chief cause of offence for him is, that the *Logos* appeared here as capable of suffering and dying and, therefore, his divine nature as altered in itself. In opposition to these thoughts Nestorius held by the Antiochian doctrine, afterwards also acknowledged by the council of Chalcedon, that the two natures in Christ were each perfect in itself and unaltered.

This was also conceded by Cyril. In his *epistola dogmatica* to Nestorius he had written: *The natures which are brought together into a true union are different, but of the two there is one Christ and one son, the difference of the natures not being destroyed by the union*¹; and in contradiction to Apollinaris he, too, contended that the *Logos* took on a perfect human nature, not only body and animal soul, but also an intellectual soul or a human intellect². Where then was the difference between this Alexandrian exponent of the two natures and Nestorius? Cyril's formula, also in the quotation which I have given, was: *one Christ out of both, out of two natures*. This formula is at the first glance unintelligible, since Cyril would not assert a mixture of the natures and, apart from some incautious utterances³, really did not do so; but it

¹ ep. 4 Migne, 77, 45 c: διάφοροι μὲν αἱ πρὸς ἐνότητα τὴν ἀληθινὴν συναχθεῖσαι φύσεις· εἰς δὲ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων Χριστὸς καὶ νιός· οὐχ ὡς τὴν τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν κ.τ.λ. ² l.c. p. 45 B.

³ Comp. e.g. *de recta fide ad Theodos.* 40, Migne, 76, 1193 B: Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς...εἰς ἐν τι τὸ μεταξὺ συγκείμενος.

is explained in Cyril by another term, viz. that of *hypostatic union*: Cyril teaches a ἐνώσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν. Nestorius, on the contrary, protested against this phrase. In his *Treatise of Heraclides* he deals much with the question of this phrase and openly says that he did not understand it then (when he first heard it) and did not understand it now¹.

Indeed this term has its difficulties. If we wish to comprehend in which sense Cyril made use of it and Nestorius opposed it, we must, as Professor Bethune-Baker rightly remarks², put out of the question that meaning of the term which is taught by the council of Chalcedon and adopted by the orthodoxy of later times, for this meaning is a result of a development, which was not yet completed when Cyril and Nestorius wrote. Originally ὑπόστασις is a synonym of *οὐσία*, if this latter is understood in the sense of real being; both words then may be translated by *substance*. As synonymous with *οὐσία* the term ὑπόστασις appears in the Nicene creed, because the *Logos* here is deduced ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός and the assertion is anathematised, that he was ἐξ ἐτέρας οὐσίας ἢ ὑποστάσεως. And Athanasius said even about the end of his life: ἡ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστι καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημανόμενον ἔχει ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ὅν³. Αὐτὸ τὸ ὅν, *the being itself*—that is the meaning of ὑπόστασις. The term

¹ *Liber Her.* B. 228=N. 138. ² *Nestorius and his teaching*, p. 47.

³ *ad Afros* 4, Migne, 26, 1036 B.

means¹ τὸ ὑποκείμενον, as Aristotle said, the ultimate reality which is the bearer of all the attributes which are called the *nature* of a thing, the *substance* in the sense in which the earlier philosophy, that of the middle ages included, made use of this term and which was afterwards criticised by Locke and Hume. The term *οὐσία* could also be used in a generic sense and then received a meaning similar to *kind* or *nature*, but ὑπόστασις means only that which *οὐσία* could mean in addition to its other meaning, viz., a single and really existing being, whether material or immaterial.

As regards the doctrine of the Trinity these two terms, originally synonymous to some extent, were differentiated: one spoke of *μία οὐσία* and *τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις* in the Trinity; but, as Professor Bethune-Baker rightly observed², there is not any clear evidence that a similar usage, a similar differentiation between *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*, had been extended in the time of Cyril to the christological problem. Hence in the discussion between Cyril and Nestorius on the relation of the Godhead and manhood in Christ the term *ὑπόστασις* must be understood as essentially synonymous with *οὐσία*. Now Nestorius, just as the earlier Antiochians, believed that the natures of Christ, as both really existing in him, had each their *ὑπόστασις*: he spoke of two *ὑποστάσεις* with as little scruple as of two

¹ Comp. Bethune-Baker, l.c. p. 48 ff.

² l.c. p. 50.

natures in Christ¹. Cyril, on the contrary, expressly condemned the διαιρεῦν τὰς ὑποστάσεις ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς Χριστοῦ², the ἐνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν excluded for him the existence of two ὑποστάσεις in Christ. In explaining this theory he is not always fortunate, and in his terminology he is not always consistent. Professor Bethune-Baker is right in saying: "His use of the expression ἐνωσις φυσική gives strong support to the view that he used the parallel expression ἐνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν in the sense of *substantial* rather than in the sense of *personal* oneness³." Nevertheless his real theory is clearly to be perceived. The divine *Logos*, he thinks, who naturally has his ὑπόστασις or is an ὑπόστασις, remained the one and the same that he was before the incarnation, also after having assumed human nature. He took in his ὑπόστασις a human body, soul and intellect as his own body, soul and intellect, so that his human nature had, therefore, no ὑπόστασις. Christ's human nature was, according to Cyril, nothing more than all the human characteristics taken as a whole, which the λόγος σεσαρκωμένος had as such. It existed, so to speak, before the incarnation as the nature or substance of the human race; but after the incarnation, because of the ἐνωσις καθ'

¹ Comp. e.g. *Liber Her.* B. 291=N. 184, B. 302=N. 192, B. 305=N. 193: *On ne doit pas concevoir une essence sans hypostase, comme si l'union avait eu lieu en une essence.*

² *ep. 17, anath. 2, Migne, 77, 120 c.*

³ *Bethune-Baker, l.c. p. 174.*

ὑπόστασιν, it cannot be regarded apart from the ὑπόστασις of the *Logos*. That is meant by Cyril's ἐκ δύο φύσεων εἰς.

It is easy to perceive that this theory is not conceivable. If it meant that the *Logos* became man in the manner of a mythical metamorphosis, this would be, although a false, yet a somewhat intelligible theory, and I am convinced that thousands of Cyril's adherents took this to be the meaning of his theory, and that even in our day thousands of simple Christian people understand the incarnation in this mythical interpretation. Cyril, however, asserted that this was not his meaning. Then, as I said, his theory is not conceivable. For what is a nature which has no real existence of its own? Is then the *Logos* not thought of as suffering and dying, in spite of Cyril's protest? or can one speak of sufferings and death where there is no suffering or dying subject, but only an impersonal nature? And is it still possible to say that Christ was a man as we are, if the human nature existed in him only as assumed in the ὑπόστασις of the *Logos* and as having become his human nature? Nestorius is quite right in reproaching Cyril that his doctrine resulted in a suppression of the manhood of Christ, for, according to Cyril's doctrine, the human intellect of Christ cannot be realised as operating in him¹. The Christ of Cyril, as

¹ *Liber Herac.* B. 341=N. 218, comp. B. 295=N. 187: *Qu'est ce que l'homme parfait qui n'agit pas et qui n'est pas mû selon la nature*

Nestorius rightly observed, did not think with the intellect of manhood, but with the intellect of the God-*Logos*; he did not feel by means of a human soul but in unity with his Godhead etc.¹

Nobody can doubt that the doctrine of the Antiochian school, which Nestorius held, was a clearer one. Christ, according to them, was really a man who thought and felt as a man and had his bodily, intellectual and moral development as other men. Nevertheless they asserted that Christ was also perfect in his Godhead, as the *Logos* is ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ. But they were blamed by their opponents for not having brought these two ideas to such an agreement, that the oneness of the person of Christ became comprehensible. They were said to have divided Christ into two persons and two sons—the eternal son of God and the son of Mary,—the first being son of God by nature and the other only by adoption.

Nestorius, too, is reproached for this, but he again and again protested against this reproach. Christ, as he continually says, was *one*: *one* Christ, *one* son of God, *one* Lord, *one* πρόσωπον². Also in the *Treatise of Heraclides* there are numerous explanations of this kind. *If you*, so he says to Cyril, *understand by the ἐνώσις de l'homme? Il n'est homme que de nom, corps de nom, âme rationnelle de nom, celui qui n'est pas mû selon la nature de son être, etc.*

¹ I.e. B. 251=N. 152.

² Comp. *Nestorian Index* s.v. *Christus* (p. 397 b), *κύριος* (p. 402 a), *νιός* (p. 407 a), *πρόσωπον* (p. 405 a).

*καθ' ὑπόστασιν the union in the πρόσωπον of Christ, then I agree with you*¹. And with the formulas which he saw proposed by Flavian of Constantinople² or found in Leo's letter to Flavian³ he showed himself well contented⁴.

Thus apologising for himself, Nestorius was not fortunate in his own time but he is in our time. For Professor Bethune-Baker has in his book on Nestorius and his teaching a particular chapter with the heading: "Two persons not the teaching of Nestorius"⁵, and here we find Professor Bethune-Baker asserting: "It is impossible to doubt that Nestorius was clear in his own mind that his doctrine of the incarnation safeguarded absolutely the unity of the subject. He did not think of two distinct persons joined together, but of a single person, who combined in Himself the two distinct substances, Godhead and manhood, with their characteristics (*natures*) complete and intact though united in Him"⁶." Of course Professor Bethune-Baker does not fail to recognise that the use of the term *πρόσωπον* in Nestorius is somewhat "puzzling"⁷, but nevertheless,

¹ *Liber Heracl.* B. 229 = N. 138 (condensed translation).

² Comp. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, 3rd edition, § 223, p. 321: *ἐν δύο φύσεσιν...ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει καὶ ἐν ἐνὶ προσώπῳ ἐνα Χριστόν, ἐνα νιόν, ἐνα κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν.*

³ Hahn, l.c. § 224, pp. 321-330; *unitas personae in utraque natura intelligenda* (c. 5, p. 326).

⁴ Comp. above, p. 22 and 25.

⁵ pp. 82-100.

⁶ l.c. p. 87.

⁷ l.c. p. 97.

without much discussion of the term *πρόσωπον*—some remarks are given¹—he arrives at the conclusion that Nestorius “used the term *person* (*πρόσωπον*) to express that in which both the Godhead and manhood of our Lord were one”²; and his final judgment is, that Nestorius, though not sharing the later orthodox phraseology which declares the human nature of the Lord impersonal in itself but personal in him only, nevertheless seems to have made an attempt to express the same conception in other terms³.

Here, I am afraid, I cannot agree with Professor Bethune-Baker, however much I sympathise with him in his doing justice to the miserable exile of Oasis.

First, it must be emphasised that *πρόσωπον* is for Nestorius not the same as what we call *person*. For our notion of *person* the main thing is the oneness of the subject or of the internal self. We can, therefore, use the term *person* only for rational beings or at least those living beings, in which—as in the case of the higher animals—we see some analogy to human thinking, feeling and willing. For Nestorius, who in this respect was influenced by the manner of speaking common at that time, the main thing in his notion of *πρόσωπον*, according to the etymology of the word and to the earlier history of its meaning⁴, was the external

¹ l.c. p. 97.

² l.c.

³ l.c. p. 98.

⁴ Comp. Siegmund Schlossmann, *Persona und Πρόσωπον im Recht und im christlichen Dogma*, Kiel and Leipsic, 1906, p. 11 ff.

undivided appearance¹. He was, therefore, able to call a bishop preaching from the pulpit *the πρόσωπον of the church* (because the church appeared in him)² and to say that Christ had exhibited in himself *the πρόσωπον of the human nature as being sinless*³. In his opinion, I believe, everything had its *πρόσωπον*, that is its appearance, its kind of being seen and judged. In not a few places in Nestorius, it is true, the meaning of *πρόσωπον* coincides with our understanding of the term *person*, e.g. "Cyril's *πρόσωπον*"⁴ means Cyril, "these *πρόσωπα*" means these persons⁵, and *εἰς καὶ ὁ αὐτός* and *ἐν πρόσωπον* may be used alternately⁶. Nevertheless, before we go further, I must lay stress on the fact that the notion of *πρόσωπον* in Nestorius grew upon another soil and, therefore, had a wider application than our term *person*.

Coming now to the matter itself I must firstly remark that the places in which Nestorius, just as Theodore

¹ Comp. *Liber Heracl.* B. 89=N. 58: *L'homme est reconnu en effet au πρόσωπον humain, c'est à dire à l'apparence du corps et à la forme (du serviteur);* comp. B. 31 ff.=N. 18 ff., where Nestorius is regarding a soldier's uniform as his *πρόσωπον*. This conception of *πρόσωπον* makes intelligible the phrasings we find B. 241=N. 145 (*dans tout ce que le prosôpon comporte*) and B. 276=N. 174 (*en tout ce qui forme le prosôpon*).

² *Nestoriana*, p. 332, 13.

³ I.c. p. 239, 18f.: *δειξας ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸ τῆς φύσεως πρόσωπον ἀμαρτίας ἐλεύθερον.*

⁴ *Liber Heracl.* B. 195=N. 117.

⁵ I.c. B. 197=N. 118.

⁶ I.c. B. 323=N. 206.

of Mopsuestia¹, speaks about two *πρόσωπα* in Christ, viz. the *πρόσωπον* of the Godhead and the *πρόσωπον* of the manhood, are more numerous² than Professor Bethune-Baker's book³ leads us to suppose. Nestorius as an adherent of the Antiochian school could as little realise a really existing nature without *πρόσωπον* as without *ὑπόστασις*⁴, for the whole of the characteristics which make the nature must, in his opinion, as necessarily have a form of appearance, *i.e.* a *πρόσωπον*, as a real being by which they are borne, *i.e.* an *ὑπόστασις*. One place in the *Treatise of Heraclides* is very characteristic in this respect. Here Nestorius is asking Cyril: *Which of the natures do you think is without πρόσωπον, that of the Godhead or that of the manhood? Then you will no longer be able to say that the God-Logos was flesh and that the flesh was Son*⁵. That is: if you think the Godhead without *πρόσωπον* then there will be lacking the form of appearance which the manhood could take on, and if the manhood, then

¹ Comp. *de incarn.* ed. H. B. Swete, *Theodori episc. Mops. in epistolas B. Pauli etc.*, II, 299, 18 ff.: ὅταν μὲν γὰρ τὰς φύσεις διακρίνωμεν, τελείαν τὴν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου φαμὲν καὶ τέλειον τὸ πρόσωπον· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπρόσωπον ἔστιν ὑπόστασιν εἰπεῖν· τελείαν δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ὄμοιως. ὅταν δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν συνάφειαν ἀπλόωμεν, ἐν πρόσωπον τότε φαμέν.

² e.g. B. 78=N. 50; B. 94=N. 61; B. 106=N. 69; B. 305=N. 194: *les natures subsistent dans leurs prosopons et dans leurs natures*; B. 341=N. 218.

³ p. 97 f.

⁴ Comp. *Liber Heracl.* B. 316=N. 202: *pour ne pas faire...les prosopons sans hypostase.*

⁵ B. 305=N. 194.

the form of appearance of the flesh which the *Logos* could take on.

Nevertheless the number of those places in which Nestorius asserts that there was *one πρόσωπον* in Christ is much greater than that of those in which he speaks about the *πρόσωπα* in Christ. The former are found in great number already in the earlier known fragments¹ and in a still greater in the *Treatise of Heraclides*². This formula is to be held as characteristic of the teaching of Nestorius. He repeats again and again that the natures were united in the *one πρόσωπον* of Christ. But what does he understand by this?

At first we must answer: Nestorius has in his mind the undivided appearance of the historic Jesus Christ. For he says, very often, that *Christ is the one πρόσωπον of the union*³. And he argued with Cyril: *You start in your account with the creator of the natures and not with the πρόσωπον of the union*⁴. *It is not the*

¹ Comp. *Nestoriana*, Index, s.v. *πρόσωπον*, p. 405 a.

² Comp. Nau's translation, Index, s.v. *prosôpon*, p. 388 b.

³ e.g. B. 212=N. 128: *C'est donc le Christ qui est le prosôpon de l'union*; B. 223=N. 134 f.: *le prosôpon d'union est le Christ*; B. 250=N. 151; B. 307=N. 195.

⁴ B. 225=N. 136; comp. B. 255=N. 154: *Pourquoi donc m'avez-vous condamné? Parce que je lui ai reproché de...commencer par celui-ci (Dieu le Verbe) et de lui attribuer toutes les propriétés*, and B. 131=N. 85: *C'est pourquoi celui-là (Cyrille), dans l'incarnation, n'attribue rien à la conduite de l'homme, mais (tout) à Dieu le Verbe, en sorte qu'il s'est servi de la nature humaine pour sa propre conduite*.

Logos who has become twofold¹; it is the one Lord Jesus Christ who is twofold in his natures². In him are seen all the characteristics of the God-Logos, who has a nature eternal and unable to suffer and die, and also all those of the manhood, that is a nature mortal, created and able to suffer, and lastly those of the union and the incarnation³. To understand this idea of Nestorius all thoughts of a substantial union ought to be dismissed. A substantial union—so Nestorius argues—including a confusion, a mixture, a natural composition, would result in a new being⁴. Here the natures are unmixed: the *Logos ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ* is bodyless⁵ and is continually what he is in eternity with the Father⁶, being without bound, without limit⁷, but the manhood has a body, is mortal, limited etc.⁸ These different natures are united not substantially but in the *πρόσωπον* of the union⁹; and it is to be noticed, that for Nestorius there is nothing singular in such a union in itself, that

¹ B. 213=N. 128; B. 215=N. 130; B. 248=N. 150; B. 296=N. 188.

² B. 213=N. 128; *Nestoriana*, p. 283, 13; 341, 2.

³ B. 249 f.=N. 151.

⁴ B. 250 f.=N. 151; comp. B. 236=N. 142.

⁵ B. 70=N. 45.

⁶ B. 265=N. 160.

⁷ B. 304=N. 193; comp. B. 239=N. 144.

⁸ B. 265=N. 160.

⁹ e.g. B. 213=N. 129: *L'union est en effet dans le prosôpon, et non dans la nature ni dans l'essence*; B. 230=N. 139: *C'est pourquoi je crie avec insistance en tout lieu que ce n'est pas à la nature, mais au prosôpon, qu'il faut rapporter ce qu'on dit sur la divinité ou sur l'humanité.*

is apart from the very natures which are united here. *I know, he says, nothing which would suit a union of different natures except a single πρόσωπον by which and in which the natures are seen, while they are giving their characteristics to this πρόσωπον*¹.

For the detailed explanation of this thought an idea is important which Professor Bethune-Baker has already noted² in the *Treatise of Heraclides*, viz. the idea that in Christ *the manhood is the πρόσωπον of the Godhead, and the Godhead the πρόσωπον of the manhood*³. Reading Professor Bethune-Baker's book one could think that this idea appeared only once or at least seldom. Really, however, it recurs again and again⁴. It is the leading idea of Nestorius that the natures of Christ made reciprocate use of their *πρόσωπα*⁵, the Godhead of the form of a servant, the manhood of the form of God⁶. In this sense in the one *πρόσωπον* of Christ, according to Nestorius, *a union of the πρόσωπα*

¹ B. 230=N. 138 f.

² p. 97.

³ B. 144=N. 168.

⁴ Comp. *e.g.* B. 78 ff.=N. 50 ff.; B. 289=N. 183; B. 305=N. 193 f.; B. 334=N. 203, etc.

⁵ Comp. *e.g.* B. 341 f.=N. 219: *Pour nous, dans les natures, nous disons un autre et un autre, et, dans l'union, un prosôpon pour l'usage de l'un avec l'autre (ou: pour leur usage mutuel); B. 289=N. 183: l'humanité utilisant le prosôpon de la divinité et la divinité le prosôpon de l'humanité; B. 307=N. 195: Ils prennent le prosôpon l'un de l'autre; B. 334=N. 213: Elles (les natures) se servent mutuellement de leurs prosôpons respectifs.*

⁶ *e.g.* B. 81=N. 52; B. 90 f.=N. 59; B. 241=N. 145.

took place¹ so that *this is that and that is this*². Professor Bethune-Baker, who did not enter into a discussion of the last quoted formulas, says in reference to the former (viz.: *The manhood is the πρόσωπον of the Godhead and the Godhead is the πρόσωπον of the manhood*³): “These words come near to eliminating ‘personality,’ as we understand it, altogether, or at all events they suggest the merging of one personality in the other, each in each. This in fact seems to be the meaning of Nestorius. He is in search of the real centre of union and he finds it here. He uses the term *πρόσωπον* to express that in which both the Godhead and manhood of our Lord were one, even while remaining distinct from one another, each retaining its own characteristics⁴.” I think that Professor Bethune-Baker is here still striving to find a metaphysical centre of union. In my opinion the idea of Nestorius is most easily⁵ understood by us, if we look at Philippians ii, 6 ff. The *form of a servant* and the *form*

¹ B. 305=N. 193: *L'union des prosôpons a eu lieu en prosôpon.* Comp. B. 213=N. 129: *L'union est en effet dans le prosôpon et non dans la nature;* B. 275=N. 174: *Il n'y a pas un autre et un autre dans le prosôpon;* B. 281=N. 177: *Nous ne disons pas un autre et un autre, car il n'y a qu'un seul prosôpon pour les deux natures.*

² B. 331=N. 211: *C'est dans le prosôpon, qu'a eu lieu l'union, de sorte que celui-ci soit celui-là et celui-là, celui-ci.* These last words are to be found very often.

³ Comp. p. 81 with note 3. Similar sentences recur again and again.

⁴ p. 97.

⁵ About the difficulties which remain see below, p. 90, note 1.

of God here spoken about do not, according to Nestorius, succeed each other, they are co-existent, *i.e.* the one Christ shows us as clearly the form of God as the form of a servant, and it is once expressly said by Nestorius that *the form is the πρόσωπον*¹. The statement, that the *πρόσωπα* interchange, means, therefore, that the *Logos* shows himself in the form of a servant and the man in the form of God, this one by humbling himself, the other by being exalted², or as Nestorius says³ with Gregory of Nazianzen⁴: *θεοῦ μὲν ἐνανθρωπήσαντος, ἀνθρώπου δὲ θεωθέντος.*

Let us examine these two thoughts further. First, that the union takes place in the *πρόσωπον* of the man.

The *Logos* humbled himself in willing obedience unto death, yea, the death of the cross, taking on the *πρόσωπον* of the man, who suffered and died, as his own *πρόσωπον*⁵. From the annunciation, the birth and the manger till death⁶ *he was found in outward being as a man, without having the nature of a man; for he did not take the nature but the form and appearance of*

¹ B. 244=N. 147.

² B. 84 f.=N 54 f.; B. 244=N. 147; B. 341=N. 218.

³ *e.g.* B. 280=N. 177; B. 307=N. 195; B. 315=N. 201; B. 330=N. 210 f.; B. 332=N. 212; B. 360=N. 231.

⁴ *ep.* 101, Migne, 37, 180 A.

⁵ Comp. B. 84 f.=N. 55; comp. B. 131=N. 85: *La forme de Dieu était en apparence comme un homme.*

⁶ B. 132=N. 85; B. 118=N. 76: *Parce qu'il était Dieu et immortel, il a accepté dans son prosôpon—lui qui n'était pas coupable—la mort, c'est à dire ce qui est mortel et capable de changement.*

a man as regards all which the πρόσωπον includes¹. But how can the *Logos* himself have the form of a servant if he did not have the human nature? An answer may be found in the following words of Nestorius: *God the Logos is said to have become flesh and son of man as regards the form and the πρόσωπον of the flesh and of the man, of which he made use in order to make himself known to the world².* *It was the flesh, in which he manifested himself, in which he taught, in which and through which he acted, and that not as being absent; he made use of His πρόσωπον in the flesh, because he wished that he himself might be the flesh and the flesh He himself³.* *God had a beginning and development by manifestation⁴.* Nestorius takes this so earnestly that he says: *Christ is also God and he is no other than God the Logos⁵.*

The second side of the idea we are discussing, viz. that the manhood in Christ shows itself in the form of God, is already partly explained by the preceding quotations, as they assert that it was the *Logos* who was to be seen in the man. But we need to have a clearer understanding of this second side of the idea

¹ B. 241=N. 145; comp. B. 252=N. 152: *Un et le même (est le) prosôpon, mais (il n'en est pas de même pour) l'essence; car l'essence de la forme de Dieu et l'essence de la forme du serviteur demeurent;* and B. 262=N. 158: *Il a pris la forme du serviteur pour son prosôpon et non pour sa nature ou par changement d'essence.*

² B. 230=N. 139.

³ B. 80=N. 51.

⁴ B. 274=N. 173; comp. below, p. 85, note 6.

⁵ B. 218=N. 132.

also. Because the *Logos* manifested himself in the form of servant, the man appeared in the form of God. *No one ever saw before that a man in his own πρόσωπον made use of the πρόσωπον of God*¹. The prophets, it is true, were to a certain extent the representatives of God², for *delegates are substitutes of the persons of those who sent them and because of this they are their πρόσωπα by virtue of their ministry*³. But in Christ the man in the real sense used the *πρόσωπον* of God, for *Christ has said: "My father and I are one," and: "He who has seen me, has seen the father"*⁴, and all honour due to the *Logos* is partaken of by the manhood, because it has become the *πρόσωπον* of the *Logos*⁵. Likewise, however, as the *Logos* did not become man by nature, so also the manhood in Christ is not deified by nature. *He who had a beginning, grew and was made perfect, so Nestorius often declares with Gregory of Nazianzen, is not God by nature, although he is called so on account of the manifestation which took place gradually*⁶. *He is*

¹ B. 76=N. 49.

² l. c.; comp. B. 82=N. 53.

³ B. 83=N. 54.

⁴ B. 76=N. 49.

⁵ B. 348=N. 223: *Dieu était aussi en lui ce qu'il était lui-même; de sorte que ce que Dieu était en lui pour la formation de son être à son image, lui aussi l'était en Dieu: le prosôpon de Dieu; B. 350=N. 224: L'homme...est Dieu par ce qui est uni.*

⁶ Gregory, ep. 101, Migne, 37, 18: *τὸ γὰρ ἡργμένον ἡ προκόπτον ἡ τελειούμενον οὐ θεός, καν διὰ τὴν κατὰ μικρὸν ἀνάδειξιν οὕτω λέγηται; Nestorius, Liber Herac. e.g. B. 273=N. 173; B. 280=N. 177; B. 283=N. 179; B. 286=N. 181; B. 332=N. 212; B. 349=N. 224; B. 360=N. 231.*

God by manifestation because he was man by nature¹. As regards the manhood he is not divine by nature but by manifestation².

But this is not all that is to be said; for the manhood in Christ, according to Nestorius, has really through the union with the *Logos* become something which it would not be otherwise. The man in Christ has the *πρόσωπον* of the son of God not only in the sense we have already discussed. For when Nestorius says that the *union took place in the πρόσωπον of the son*³, then this does not mean only that aspect of the interchange of the *πρόσωπα*, on account of which the manhood as really bore the *πρόσωπον* of the *Logos* as the latter took up the *πρόσωπον* of the man⁴. Here a new idea is to be noticed. *Although—so Nestorius says—the Logos was the son of God even before the incarnation, nevertheless after having taken on the manhood, he can no more alone be called the son; lest we should assert the existence of two sons*⁵. The manhood has become the son of God *because of the son, united with it*⁶. Again and again Nestorius repeats that two sons of God was not his doctrine.

¹ B. 349=N. 224. ² B. 288=N. 182. ³ B. 231=N. 140.

⁴ Comp. B. 331=N. 211: *A cause de celui qui l'a pris pour son prosôpon, celui qui a été pris obtient d'être le prosôpon de celui qui l'a pris.*

⁵ *Nestorian*, p. 275, 1-5 (condensed).

⁶ *Nestorian*, p. 274, 17: *νιὸς διὰ τὸν συνημμένον νιὸν*; *Liber Heracl.* B. 145=N. 168: *Cette humanité est dite le Fils de Dieu par l'union avec le Fils (et non par la nature)*; B. 80=N. 51:...et il a

One will understand this better if a new line of thought is followed, which in Nestorius is clearly shown to us only by the *Treatise of Heraclides*. To Adam the *Logos* as his creator gave his image in all glory and honour¹, but Adam lost it for himself and for his descendants². Hence the *Logos* became man in order to efface the fault of the first man and to give back to his nature the original image³. Only he could do it: apart from him there was nothing divine or honourable⁴, and only in the manhood could this renovation take place⁵. Nestorius gives in this connection a complete answer to the question: *Cur deus homo*⁶? and it is not

donné à la forme du serviteur (qui est) sa forme, un nom qui l'emporte sur tous les noms, c'est à dire le nom de Fils, auquel tout genou, etc.

¹ B. 90=N. 58. ² B. 91=N. 59; B. 107 f.=N. 70.

³ B. 91=N. 59. ⁴ l.c.

⁵ B. 267=N. 161: *On avait besoin de la divinité adhérente pour... refaire la forme de l'image qui avait été détruite par nous; (on avait besoin) aussi de l'humanité qui fut renouvelée et qui reprit sa forme; l'humanité était nécessaire pour observer l'ordre, qui avait existé.*

⁶ e.g. B. 297=N. 188: *Dieu le Verbe s'est incarné pour faire de l'humanité la forme de Dieu en lui, et pour le renouveler en lui dans la nature de l'humanité..., parce que lui seul pouvait rénover celui qui était tombé en premier lieu par la transgression de l'inobservance des préceptes; et il donna sa vie pour lui, pour les observer, parce qu'il ne suffisait pas qu'il se conservât sans péché; sinon, notre chute serait demeurée sans guérison comme le paralytique qui se soigne et qui reste sans marcher, mais pour qui le médecin marche, et qui le porte, mais qui ne lui dit pas: "Lève-toi (et) marche, car tu a été guéri pour marcher."* C'est pourquoi il a pris une forme de serviteur qui était sans péché dans sa création, au point de recevoir dans les observances des préceptes un nom supérieur à tous les noms, et de fortifier, par les observances et par la vigilance, ce qui était dans la rénovation de sa créature.

only by physical categories as in Athanasius' *de incarnatione*¹ that Nestorius argues. The idea is further not exhausted by the thought that the *Logos* took such a form of a servant, *as was without sin in its creation*². The main thing is that the *Logos* in the form of a servant brought into existence a sinless man³; hence the stress is laid on the moral and religious development of Jesus.

The man alone, even the second Adam, would not have been able to remain sinless⁴; but *God was acting in him, and observed the commandments in his place because he was in this nature*⁵. Christ had all that belongs to a true man, but *without being deprived of the union with God the Logos*⁶. *God's will was his own will*⁷; *he raised his soul to God conforming his volitions to those of God, so that he was an image of the archetype of the*

¹ Migne, ser. graeca 25, 96–197; comp. A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 4th edition, Tübingen, 1909, II, 159–162.

² *Liber Heracl.* B. 297=N. 188 (see p. 87, note 6).

³ *Nestoriana*, p. 239, 19: *δειξας ἐν ἐαυτῷ τὸ τῆς φύσεως πρόσωπον ἀμαρτίας ἐλεύθερον.*

⁴ *Liber Heracl.* B. 298=N. 189.

⁵ l.c.

⁶ B. 133=N. 86.

⁷ B. 102=N. 67; compare the preceding sentence: *Parce que donc il s'est humilié en toute chose d'une façon incompréhensible par une humiliation sans pareille, il est apparu encore un seul esprit, une seule volonté, une seule intelligence inséparable et indivisible, comme dans un seul être.* Comp. also *Nestoriana*, fragments, 197, 198, 201 and 202 (pp. 65 f. and 219 f. and 224) the genuineness of which perhaps may be defended with more confidence than I showed, in my *Nestoriana* (p. 65 f.).

image of God¹, viz. the *Logos*. So *he renewed our nature in himself by means of a perfect obedience²* till the death, to which he *was condemned for us³* and through which he, as being sinless, gained the victory over the devil⁴. By means of this renewal *humanity received the form of the sonship of him who had created it⁵*. And together with and by virtue of the gift of sonship there was given to the manhood also a share in the position of power and dominion of the son of God⁶.

Now I come to the question: Did Nestorius really make the unity of the natures in the one person of Christ intelligible? As long as one starts by pointing to the *Logos* on the one side and the man on the other, it is comprehensible that a negative answer should have been given. The Antiochian formulas, which are found in Nestorius, *e.g.* διὰ τὸν φοροῦντα τὸν φορούμενον σέβω, διὰ τὸν κεκρυμμένον προσκυνῶ τὸν φαινόμενον⁷ and: ὁμολογῶμεν τὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεόν, σέβωμεν τὸν τῇ θείᾳ συναφείᾳ τῷ παντοκράτορι θεῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον ἀνθρωπον⁸, seem again and again to force

¹ B. 96=N. 62; comp. B. 102=N. 66: *La forme de serviteur l'a servi absolument comme il le voulait.*

² B. 342=N. 219.

³ B. 102=N. 66.

⁴ Comp. B. 297=N. 188; B. 299=N. 189; *Nestoriana*, p. 344 ff.

⁵ B. 299=N. 189.

⁶ *Nestoriana*, p. 361, 22; comp. above, p. 86 f., note 6.

⁷ *Nestoriana*, p. 262, 3 f.

⁸ l.c. p. 249, 2 ff.

us to such a negative answer. Besides the one *πρόσωπον* of Christ we find the two *πρόσωπα*¹, one of each nature,

¹ Comp. above, p. 78, and B. 348=N. 223: *les prosôpons de l'union*. Nestorius was even able to write: *Nous ne disons pas union des prosôpons, mais des natures* (B. 252=N. 152), and as it is not the translator who is to be blamed for the contradiction to other statements of Nestorius which is to be seen here (comp. above, p. 82, note 1), it must be conceded that Nestorius in his terminology was not quite free from inaccuracy (which is to be observed also in his position toward the comparison of the union in Christ to the union of body and soul, comp B. 236=N. 142 and B. 292=N. 185). Nevertheless there is no real contradiction in Nestorius' thoughts. What he is denying (B. 252=N. 152) is one natural prosôpon: *C'est pourquoi l'union a lieu pour le prosôpon et non pour la nature. Nous ne disons pas union des prosôpons, mais des natures. Car dans l'union il n'y a qu'un seul prosôpon, mais dans les natures un autre et un autre, de sorte que le prosôpon soit reconnu sur l'ensemble* (B. 252=N. 152). This is clearly to be seen also in other passages, e.g. B. 304 f.=N. 193: *Ce n'est pas sans prosôpon et sans hypostase que chacune d'elles (viz. natures) est connue dans les diversités des natures. On ne conçoit pas deux prosôpons des fils, ni encore deux prosôpons des hommes, mais d'un seul homme, qui est mu de la même manière par l'autre. L'union des prosôpons a eu lieu en prosôpon et non en essence ni en nature. On ne doit pas concevoir une essence sans hypostase, comme si l'union avait eu lieu en une essence et qu'il y eut un prosôpon d'une seule essence. Mais les natures subsistent dans leurs prosôpons et dans leurs natures et dans le prosôpon d'union. Quant au prosôpon naturel de l'une, l'autre se sert du même en vertu de l'union; ainsi il n'y a qu'un prosôpon pour les deux natures.*—B. 239=N. 144:...*le prosôpon de l'une est aussi celui de l'autre et réciproquement.*—B. 333 f.=N. 212 f.: *La divinité se sert du prosôpon de l'humanité et l'humanité de celui de la divinité; de cette manière nous disons un seul prosôpon pour les deux.*—B. 340=N. 218: *Ne comprends tu pas, comment les pères confessent un prosôpon de deux natures? et que les différences des natures ne sont pas supprimées à cause de l'union parce qu'elles se réunissent en un seul prosôpon, qui appartient aux natures et aux prosôpons.*—We need however, a more exhaustive examination of

asserted. There is, as Nestorius himself says, a difference between *the Lord Jesus Christ* and the *Logos*¹; or: *the terms God-Logos and Christ do not have the same meaning*². For, though *Christ* is not outside the *Logos*³, nevertheless the *Logos* is not limited by the body⁴. Christ spoke of the *Logos* as of his *πρόσωπον* and as if he were one and had the same *πρόσωπον*⁵; there appeared one spirit, one will, one inseparable and indivisible intellect as in one being⁶; we regard this one as that one and that one as this one, although this one and that one remain⁷. But if one keeps in mind that Nestorius rejected the idea of a substantial union which would include an alteration of the *Logos*, then one must say that he came as near as possible to the idea of a union. Where a substantial union is excluded, there the union can only come about on a spiritual plane. Hence Nestorius says that the incarnation took place *through an intelligent and rational soul*⁸. By means of the soul a relation is set up between

Nestorius' terminology, especially of the meaning of *πρόσωπον* in his works. In B. 240 f.=N. 145 (*Ces choses [corps et âme] s'unissent en une nature et en prosôpon naturel. Dieu prit pour lui la forme du serviteur et non d'un autre pour son prosôpon et sa filiation; ainsi sont ceux qui sont unis en une nature. Il prit la forme du serviteur, etc.*) the words *ainsi sont ceux qui sont unis en une nature* must have been inadvertently transposed: their place, in my opinion, is before *Dieu prit pour lui*, etc.

¹ B. 120=N. 133.

² B. 254=N. 153.

³ I.e.

⁴ B. 239=N. 144.

⁵ B. 79=N. 51.

⁶ B. 102=N. 67 (see above, p. 88, note 7: *comme*).

⁷ B. 348=N. 223.

⁸ B. 128=N. 83.

the *Logos* and the man, and this relation is on both sides one of free will¹, a relation of love², a relation of giving on the one side and of taking on the other³, a relation that becomes so close, that the one presents himself as the other, and that the *form of God* shows itself in the *form of a servant* and the *form of a servant* is teaching, acting, etc. in the *form of God*.

We must observe, it is true, that the man is God not by nature, but only because God reveals Himself in him, and that the *Logos* is not flesh by nature, but only manifests himself in the flesh⁴. But also my late colleague Dr Martin Kähler († Sept. 7th, 1912), who was regarded as orthodox, held it to be *a vain attempt to combine two independent beings or two persons in an individual life*⁵. He himself thought that the union of the Godhead and manhood will become intelligible *if understood as a reciprocity of two personal actions*,

¹ B. 264 f.=N. 159:...*une union volontaire en prosôpon et non en nature.*

² B. 81=N. 52: *unies par l'amour et dans le même prosôpon*; B. 275=N. 174: *réunies en égalité par adhésion (συνάφεια) et par amour.*

³ B. 299=N. 189 f.:...*afin que le prosôpon fût commun à celui qui donnait la forme et à celui qui la recevait à cause de son obéissance*; B. 348=N. 223: *Par les prosôpons de l'union l'un est dans l'autre et cet 'un' n'est pas conçu par diminution, ni par suppression, ni par confusion, mais par l'action de recevoir et de donner et par l'usage de l'union de l'un avec l'autre, les prosôpons recevant et donnant l'un et l'autre.*

⁴ Comp. above, p. 83 f. and 85.

⁵ Kähler, *Die Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre*, 3rd edition, Leipsic, 1905, § 388, p. 339.

viz. a creative action on the part of the eternal Godhead and a receiving action on the part of the developing manhood¹. If thus justice is done to the idea of the unity of the natures in one person, then Nestorius, too, made it intelligible, even where he, dealing with the *Logos* on the one side and the man on the other, tries to understand the union as the result of the incarnation. His understanding of *πρόσωπον*, it is true, does not coincide with what we mean by "person"—we cannot free ourselves from metaphysics—but we, too, can sympathise with him when he took the incarnation as meaning this, that in the person of Jesus the *Logos* revealed himself in human form so that the *Logos* exhibited himself as man and that the man of history was the manifestation of the *Logos* in such a way that he exhibited himself to us as the eternal *Logos*². We, too, therefore, understand what Nestorius means when he said that the *πρόσωπον* of the one is also that of the other.

Still more intelligible does the christology of Nestorius become to us, if, following his advice, we start from the one *πρόσωπον* of the union, *i.e.* from the one Jesus Christ of history³. As regards him we are

¹ *l.c.*

² Comp. *Liber Heracl.* B. 362=N. 233: *l'incarnation est conçue comme l'usage mutuel des deux (prosôpons) par prise et don.*

³ *Liber Heracl.* B. 230=N. 139 and in many other places the *prosôpon* of the union evidently is the *prosôpon* of the flesh. Comp. B. 304 f.=N. 193 (above p. 90, note 1): *On ne conçoit pas deux*

able to speak of one person in our sense of the word also. This one person, it is true, is not simply the *Logos*, as this is not limited by the body, but still less is he a mere man. This Jesus Christ of history is the beginner of a new humanity and at the same time the personal revelation of God, and he is the one because he is the other. Only the renewed manhood could become the image of God, but even this was only possible because the God-*Logos* was acting here in the manhood by means of a union of giving and taking¹.

Is this orthodox? The answer I will give in the next lecture.

IV

It was not the personal character of Nestorius which caused his tragic fortune; if he was guilty, it was his doctrine which was to be blamed—this we saw in the preceding lecture. We have tried, therefore, to gain an idea of his teaching. Was Nestorius orthodox? What is his position in the history of dogma?—these are the questions which will occupy us to-day.

The question as to whether Nestorius was orthodox cannot be regarded as really answered by the anathema of the so-called *third ecumenical council of Ephesus*, *prosôpons des fils, ni encore deux prosôpons des hommes, mais d'un seul homme, qui*, etc.

¹ Comp. above, p. 88.

because, as we saw¹, an ecumenical council of Ephesus never existed. It was only the party council of Cyril which condemned Nestorius, while the council of the Antiochians was on his side, and the question of doctrine was still undecided even when the council consisting of these two party councils was dissolved. The idea that Nestorius was condemned by "the holy ecumenical council" was only the result of the ecclesiastical-political transactions of which the union of 433 was the outcome². This fiction and the consent of the Antiochians, which they were ignominiously forced to give, cannot help us to decide the question, all the more so since Nestorius could have accepted the doctrinal basis of the peace, although his condemnation was its result.

The standard of measure for Nestorius' doctrine must, therefore, be the definition of that ecumenical council which gave the first decision about the christological question (although proved later to be a preliminary one), viz. the fourth ecumenical council of Chalcedon, of 451.

The definition of this council, which is to be seen not only in its creed but also in its recognition of Leo's letter to Flavian and Cyril's *epistola dogmatica*³ and *epistola ad Orientales*⁴, was a compromise, as the Roman legates could not and would not give up the letter of Leo, while the majority of the Eastern bishops were for

¹ Above, p. 53.

² Comp. above, p. 56.

³ Comp. above, p. 37.

⁴ Comp. above, p. 53.

their part tied to the Cyrillian tradition. Without doubt, however, there is no real harmony between these different standards of faith. For Leo's letter declares: *Agit utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est, verbo scilicet operante quod verbi est et carne exequente quod carnis est; unum horum coruscat miraculis, alterum succumbit injuriis*¹, but Severus of Antioch, the well-known later monophysite, was right, when he said: *οὐ γὰρ ἐνεργεῖ ποτε φύσις οὐχ ὑφεστῶσα προσωπικῶς*², and for Cyril the human nature of Christ was a *φύσις οὐχ ὑφεστῶσα*, as is shown by his understanding of the *ἔνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν*³. Nay, in his *epistola synodica* to Nestorius⁴ he even anathematised the *διαιρεῖν τὰς ὑποστάσεις μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν* and required a union of the natures *καθ' ἔνωσιν φυσικήν*⁵. This disharmony between the Cyrillian tradition and that of the western church represented by Leo showed itself also during the proceedings of the council in a very distinct manner, when the wording of the creed was deliberated. The first draft of this creed contained the words *ἐκ δύο φύσεων εἰς*⁶, which corresponded to the

¹ Ch. iv; Mansi, v, 1375 c^D; Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, 3rd edition, p. 325.

² *Doctrina patrum*, ed. F. Diekamp, Münster, 1907, p. 310, 19 f.

³ Comp. above, p. 72.

⁴ Comp. above, p. 44.

⁵ *Anath.* 3, Migne, 77, 120 c.

⁶ This document was not inserted in the Proceedings (Mansi, vii, 100 D: *ὅπου, δν ἔδοξε μὴ ἐνταγῆναι τοῖσδε τοῦς ὑπομνήμασι*) and now, therefore, is lost, but there cannot be any doubt, that it contained the words *ἐκ δύο φύσεων εἰς* (comp. Mansi, vii, 103 D: *τοῖσδε τοῦς ὑπομνήμασι*).

Cyrillian tradition, but Leo asserted in his letter, that the unity of Christ's person was seen "in two natures¹," and especially blamed Eutyches for not having been willing to concede the duality of the natures after the incarnation, while allowing the term *ἐκ δύο φύσεων εἰς*². The Roman legates, therefore, energetically opposed the phrase *ἐκ δύο φύσεων* in the draft of the creed³ and they succeeded in substituting *ἐν δύο φύσεσιν* for *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*⁴. One self-consistent view, therefore, could not be attained in Chalcedon; a compromise had to be made. And it was made by recognising as standards of faith at the same time Leo's letter and Cyril's *epistola dogmatica* and *epistola ad Orientales*⁵. Cyril's *epistola synodica*, which understood the *ἐνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν* in the sense of a *ἐνωσις φυσική*, was not

definitio...ex duabus naturis habet, and 106 c: *Dioscorus dicebat: "Quod ex duabus naturis est, suscipio, duas non suscipio"; sanctissimus autem archiepiscopus Leo duas naturas dicit esse in Christo... Quem igitur sequimini? sanctissimum Leonem, aut Dioscorum?*

¹ Ch. 5, Mansi, v, 1379 b: *Propter hanc unitatem personae in utraque natura intelligendam* (comp. the preceding note).

² Ch. 6, Mansi, v, 1386 f.

³ Mansi, vii, 101 a b; comp. above, p. 96 f. note 6.

⁴ Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, 3rd edition, p. 166; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 2nd edition, ii, 470 f. note 1.

⁵ Mansi, vii, 113 b c. The meaning of the sentence *τὰς τοῦ μακαρίου Κυρίλλου...συνοδικὰς ἐπιστολὰς πρὸς τε Νεστόριον καὶ πρὸς τοὺς τῆς ἀνατολῆς...έδέξατο* is illustrated by the fact, that Cyril's *epistola dogmatica* and *epistola ad Orientales*, but not his *epistola synodica*, were previously (Mansi, vi, 959 a b, 959 d, 971 a b, 973 c) approved. Comp. p. 98 note 1.

approved by the council¹, and its creed, by treating the words *ὑπόστασις* and *persona* as identical, interpreted the term *ἐνώσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν* in the sense of a *personal* union. By this interpretation Cyril's *epistola dogmatica*, which contained this term², was made acceptable to western thought. But even Cyril's *epistola synodica* with its anathematisms, once so sharply attacked by the Antiochians, although it was not recognised, was spared criticism³. And more, Dioscorus, Cyril's successor, who had been a more incautious upholder of the Alexandrian tradition than Cyril and who at the Robber-synod had declared the assertion of two natures after the union to be unlawful⁴, although he was deposed, was nevertheless not declared a heretic⁵. On the other side also Theodoret, whom a decree of the Robber-synod had deposed⁶, was present in Chalcedon. Pope Leo

¹ This is expressly said in the *Collatio cum Severianis* (Mansi, VIII, 821 B—822 A) and is to be seen also in the proceedings of the Chalcedonian council itself (comp. Ermoni, *De Leontio Byzantino*, Paris, 1895, p. 100 f. and 111 f.). I now give up my former opinion, that Cyril's *epistola synodica* was implicitly acknowledged (*Leontius von Byzanz* 1887, p. 50, Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 646, 40).

² Migne, 77, 48 B: ἐὰν δὲ τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἐνώσιν...παραιτούμεθα, ἐμπίπτομεν εἰς τὸ δύο λέγειν νιούς.

³ That is less than “acknowledged *implicite*” (comp. above note 1).

⁴ Mansi, VI, 737 C.

⁵ Mansi, VI, 1094 f., comp. Mansi, VII, 103 B: *Anatolius...dixit: propter fidem non est damnatus Dioscorus, sed quia excommunicationem fecit domino archiepiscopo Leoni et tertio vocatus est et non venit.*

⁶ *The second synod of Ephesus together with etc.* ed. by S. G. F. Perry, 1881, pp. 251–258.

had recognised him as orthodox¹, the imperial commissioners stood up for his right to be a member of the council², and the synod rehabilitated him after he had consented to anathematize Nestorius³. Nevertheless he was not forced to retract his book against Cyril's anathematisms. In the same way Ibas of Edessa, who had likewise been deposed in 449⁴, was at Chalcedon reinstated as bishop⁵, without having been forced to recant what he had said in his letter to Maris about Cyril's "Apollinarism" as he called it, although this letter had been condemned by the Robber-synod.

Hence it follows, that the decision of Chalcedon was interpreted in very different ways by the western church, by the adherents of Cyril and by Theodoret, Ibas and other Antiochians. It is, therefore, impossible to answer in one sentence the question whether Nestorius was orthodox according to the standard of the Chalcedonian definition.

It is certain that he could have accepted the creed of Chalcedon and its standards of faith as easily as Theodoret, for he could have reconciled himself to Cyril's *epistola dogmatica* if understanding the *ἐνώσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν* in the sense of a *personal* union, and what Theodoret, yielding to pressure, had anathematized in

¹ Mansi, vii, 190 D.

² Mansi, vi, 592 D and vii, 190 B.C.

³ Mansi, vii, 190 A B and 191 B-D.

⁴ Perry, l. c. p. 134 f.

⁵ Mansi, vii, 262-70.

his old friend¹, Nestorius had never taught, nay he had even expressly rejected such assertions². Nestorius can therefore be regarded as orthodox according to the Antiochian interpretation of the Chalcedonian definition.

The formulas contained in Leo's letter, as we shall see later more accurately, had their root in a view somewhat different from that of Nestorius, but Nestorius had endeavoured more earnestly than Leo to make intelligible the oneness of the person of Christ³, and in any case he himself approved of Leo's letter⁴. Thus according also to the western interpretation of the Chalcedonian definition Nestorius can be regarded as orthodox.

On the other hand, an interpretation according to the Cyrilian tradition could not have been accepted by Nestorius, and measured by the standard of such an interpretation he could not be regarded as orthodox. Such an interpretation, however, had considerable difficulties. For, while to western thinking Cyril's letters, which were recognised at Chalcedon, had been made acceptable by interpretation, there was at that time in the East⁵ no Cyrilian theology, *i.e.* no theology

¹ Mansi, VII, 189 B: ἀνάθεμα Νεστορίῳ καὶ τῷ μὴ λέγοντι τὴν ἀγίαν Μαρίαν θεοτόκον καὶ τῷ εἰς δύο νιούς μερίζοντι τὸν ἔνα νιὸν τὸν μονογενῆ.

² Comp. above p. 31 f. and 74 and his *epistola ad Constantinopolitanos* (comp. above p. 24 f.), ch. 2, Nau, p. 374.

³ Leo asserted the *unitas personae*, but made no attempt to show how this *unitas personae* was to be imagined (comp. below p. 113).

⁴ See above p. 22.

following the Cyrillian tradition, which could digest Leo's letter. The quarrels about the decision of Chalcedon show how disagreeable it was to the majority of the Eastern Christians.

Hence as long as we apply no other standard than the Chalcedonian definition, the statement of Professor Bethune-Baker, that Nestorius was orthodox, is not to be held a false one. It was a tragic feature in the fortune of Nestorius, that he had already been condemned, when the council, whose creed he could have accepted, was held.

The Chalcedonian definition, however, was not the final one. The uncertainty as to how its formulas were to be interpreted was removed. The first step of importance in this direction was the Henotikon of the Emperor Zeno in 482¹. This edict, indeed, did not condemn the Chalcedonian definition, but in actual opposition to Leo's letter and to its assertion about the operation of each nature in Christ² it expressly declared : *ἐνὸς εἰναί φαμεν τά τε θαύματα καὶ τὰ πάθη*³, condemning at the same time everyone who then or earlier, at Chalcedon or elsewhere, thought otherwise⁴. That means that an interpretation of the Chalcedonian definition according to the Cyrillian tradition only was to be regarded as right, while Leo's letter with all its

¹ Evagrius, h. e. 3, 14, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier p. 111-114.

² See above p. 96.

³ Evagrius l. c. p. 113, 9.

⁴ l. c. p. 113, 21 ff.

contents, which did not suit the Cyrillian point of view, was practically put aside. The eastern church, while under the Henotikon, on the whole enjoyed peace—the Antiochian tradition having been put into the background—but between it and the western church a schism arose. When in 519 a settlement was reached, the Henotikon being at the same time abrogated, the question as to how the decree of Chalcedon, then reacknowledged, was to be interpreted, came again to the fore in the East.

This time it did not remain long without an answer, for at the same time the activity of the so-called Scythian monks began, and this was important just because they developed a theology wholly along the lines of Cyril, which nevertheless could do justice to all requirements of the Chalcedonian definition¹. It was scholastic arguing, creation of terms and logical distinctions, which brought into existence this Cyrillian-Chalcedonian orthodoxy. Only one of these saving terms need be mentioned, namely *ἐνυποστασία*. This term allowed the assertion that the human nature of Christ, although it had no *ὑπόστασις* of its own, nevertheless was not without *ὑπόστασις*, the *ὑπόστασις* of the *Logos* becoming that of the human nature, too. By the help of this term the twofold operation of the natures, spoken of in Leo's letter, could be accepted,

¹ Comp. my *Dogmengeschichte*, 4th edition, 1906, p. 304 f. and my *Leontius von Byzanz*, 1887, pp. 60-74.

the one *ὑπόστασις* of the *Logos* being thought of as the actual subject of the operation of the divine and human nature of Christ. Really, however, this doctrine of the Enhypostasia is identical with the Cyrillian view of the Anhypostasia of Christ's human nature, for actually it assumed that the *Logos* and the human nature became one being in the same sense as understood by Cyril, when he used the term *ἔνωσις φυσική* and the phrase *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη* which had come in the orthodox tradition through the Apollinaristic forgeries¹. There was now only the possibility of abstract separation of the natures in Christ². As a shibboleth of their Cyrillian-Chalcedonian orthodoxy, the Scythian monks used the phrase: *ἔνα τῆς ἀγίας τριάδος πέπονθε σαρκί*, and this phrase was really characteristic. For, like Cyril, it makes the *Logos* the subject even of the sufferings, while by the addition of *σαρκί*, which naturally was not uncyrillian, it was asserted, that the natures were not mixed through the union; and to some extent justice was done also to Leo's letter, which contended that it was the human nature which suffered. The Antiochian tradition naturally was considered to be insupportable by this new orthodoxy. The Scythian monks, therefore, acted consistently in demanding that Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, the famous teachers of the Antiochian

¹ Comp. my *Dogmengeschichte*, 4th edition, p. 270 and 293.

² Comp. my *Leontius*, p. 71.

school, although they had died in the peace of the church should be anathematised, as well as Nestorius¹.

This Cyrillian-Chalcedonian orthodoxy was supported by the emperor Justinian, and the fifth ecumenical council, held in Constantinople in 553, approved the emperor's church-policy and the doctrine which he had supported².

The condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of the anti-cyrillian writings of Theodoret and Ibas, sanctioned by this council³, clearly manifested the fact that an Antiochian interpretation of the Chalcedonian definition no longer was allowed. And twice in the decision of the council an Antiochian interpretation of Chalcedonian formulas was expressly anathematised⁴. Cyril, therefore, remained master of the field. Even

¹ Leontius, *contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, 3, 7 ff. and 3, 37 ff. Migne, ser. graeca, 86, 1364–1387.

² Comp. the anathematisms of this council, Mansi, ix, 375–388, Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, 3rd edition, pp. 168–172.

³ Anath. 12–14.

⁴ Anath. 5: Εἰ τις τὴν μίαν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ οὕτως ἐκλαμβάνει, ὡς ἐπιδεχομένην πολλῶν ὑποστάσεων σημασίαν καὶ διὰ τούτου... ἐν πρόσωπον λέγει κατὰ ἀξίαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ προσκύνησιν καθάπερ Θεόδωρος καὶ Νεστόριος μαινόμενοι συνεγράψαντο· καὶ συκοφαντεῖ τὴν ἀγίαν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον, ὡς κατὰ ταύτην τὴν ἀσεβῆ ἔννοιαν χρησαμένην τῷ τῆς μιᾶς ὑποστάσεως ρήματι... ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.—Anath. 6: Εἴ τις καταχρηστικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀληθῶς, θεοτόκον λέγει τὴν ἀγίαν ἔνδοξον ἀειπαρθένον Μαρίαν ἥ κατὰ ἀναφοράν, ὡς..., καὶ συκοφαντεῖ τὴν ἀγίαν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον, ὡς κατὰ ταύτην τὴν ἀσεβῆ ἐπινοηθεῖσαν παρὰ Θεοδώρου ἔννοιαν θεοτόκον τὴν παρθένον εἰπούσαν... ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

his *epistola synodica* actually was approved, for Theodore and Ibas were criticized for having attacked it¹.

The term ἐνωσις φυσική, used in Cyril's *epistola synodica*, was left, it is true, unapproved; for this term could have been understood as allowing the assumption that the natures in Christ were mixed through their union. Nevertheless, what Cyril really meant by the term ἐνωσις φυσική was accepted; for the ἐνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν is interpreted in the sense of an ἐνωσις κατὰ σύνθεσιν². The *Logos* took on—this is the doctrine of the council—a human σάρξ with ψυχή and νοῦς in such a way, that out of the two natures came one Christ³, who was the subject as of the θαυματουργεῖν so of the παθεῖν⁴; the two natures, of which the one Christ is composed, are only to be distinguished abstractly⁵, the *Logos* himself was born a second time through Mary⁶, the ἐσταυρωμένος is εἰς τῆς ἀγίας τριάδος⁷.

There can be no doubt, that, measured by the

¹ Anath. 13: Εἴτις ἀντιποιεῖται τῶν ἀσεβῶν συγγραμμάτων Θεοδορίτου τῶν κατὰ...τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις Κυρίλλου καὶ τῶν ιβ' αὐτοῦ κεφαλαίων...καὶ...οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει...πάντας τοὺς γράψαντας κατὰ...τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις Κυρίλλου καὶ τῶν δώδεκα αὐτοῦ κεφαλαίων...ό τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Anath. 14 (against Ibas) has an analogous wording.

² Anath. 4: 'Η...έκκλησία...τὴν ἐνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου πρὸς τὴν σάρκα κατὰ σύνθεσιν ὁμολογεῖ, ὅπερ ἐστὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν.

³ Anath. 8.

⁴ Anath. 3.

⁵ Anath. 8.:...τῇ θεωρίᾳ μόνη τὴν διαφορὰν τούτων λαμβάνειν, ἐξ αὐτοῦ συνετέθη.

⁶ Anath. 2.

⁷ Anath. 10; comp. 5.

standard of these decisions, the christology of Nestorius is to be called heterodox. It was the main purpose of all the anathematisms of the council to show the Nestorian understanding of the *ενωσις*, of the *ἐν πρόσωπον*, and of the *θεοτόκος*, to be heretical.

And these decisions remained valid. The sixth ecumenical council, it is true, in opposition to the Greeks, who were drawing back gradually and too openly from the formulas of Chalcedon, sanctioned the Dyotheticism, asserting, under the strong influence of the western church, the difference between the natures of Christ also as regards the *ἐνέργεια* and the *φυσικὰ θελήματα*¹, but it left the Cyrilian interpretation of the Chalcedonian creed untouched and even gave to the dyothetic statement a look suited to the Cyrilian tradition; for it said that the human will became in the same sense the real will of the *Logos* as the human flesh became his flesh, the human soul his soul, the human intellect his intellect², and that the *Logos* had his being also in the human *ἐνέργειν* and *θέλειν*³. Even if some other parts were added to the apparatus of flesh, soul, intellect, energy, will, which was regarded as composing the human nature, it would not have mattered, since the Cyrilian doctrine had won the

¹ Comp. the creed of the council (approved the 16th of September 861), *Mansi*, xi, 631–640, the main section of which is to be found also in Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole etc.*, 3rd edition, pp. 172–174.

² *Mansi*, xi, 637 c.d.

³ *I. c.* xi, 637 e sq.

victory, and since there existed now in the East a theology which was able to master difficult formulas by means of scholastic distinctions and arguments.

Also the Occident, as far as it belonged to the East-Roman Empire, Rome included, had had to accept the Cyrillian-Chalcedonian orthodoxy of the council of 553; and Rome led the young nations of the mediaeval world in the same direction. When in the Adoptianism of Spain old western tradition, not consistent with the Cyrillian-Chalcedonian orthodoxy, emerged once again, the Carolingian theologians with the agreement of Rome rejected them, and Alcuin in conformity with the Cyrillian-Chalcedonian orthodoxy contended: *in assumptione carnis a deo persona perit hominis, non natura*¹.

There cannot, therefore, be the least doubt, that Nestorius was an exponent of a doctrine which even if not through the decree of Chalcedon, at least through the decisions of later time, was condemned by the church. Hence, measured by the standard of church-orthodoxy, Nestorius—in spite of all Professor Bethune-Baker's attempts to save him—must be regarded as a heretic.

Nevertheless his doctrine has more historical right than the Cyrillian orthodoxy. That is what remains for me to show.

Nestorius was a pupil of the Antiochian school; all

¹ *adv. Felicem* 2, 12, Migne, ser. latina 101, 156 A.

Antiochian theologians were at first on his side. He seems to have endeavoured more earnestly than the greatest teachers of his school, Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, to make intelligible the oneness of the person of Christ. An absolute decision is not possible in this case, as the chief dogmatic works of Diodore and Theodore are lost. But even if appearance speak the truth—I shall return to this question later¹—it is nevertheless without doubt, that the fundamental ideas and the decisive formulas which we find in Nestorius were part of the traditional teaching of his school.

It was not Diodore or even Theodore who first created these formulas; they had already been used by Eustathius bishop of Antioch (who was deposed in 330). We are able to observe this, although only small fragments of his works are preserved². It is proved not only by the idea, that it was not the *Logos* who was born, who suffered, but the man, whom he joined with

¹ See below p. 126.

² The only book of Eustathius which is preserved intact (*De Engastrimytho*, Migne, ser. graeca 18, 613–676) is of little value here. The fragments of other works were first collected by J. A. Fabricius (*Bibliotheca graeca* ed. Harles ix, 1804, pp. 136–149)—these fragments (about 35 in number) are the most important ones—; in Migne (18, 676–696) the number of fragments is enlarged to about 50; and a collection of 86 fragments (of which those, which were formerly known, for the most part are not given in full text) is to be found in *S. Eustathii, episcopi Antiocheni, in Lazarum, Mariam et Martham homilia christologica* (which is spurious)...*edita cum commentario de fragmentis eustathianis opera et studio Ferdinandi Cavallera*, Paris, 1905.

him¹, whom he resuscitated from the dead², and who then became his *σύνθρονος*³, and also not only by phrases as ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὃν ἐφόρησεν⁴, or ἀνθρώπινον ὅργανον⁵ or κατοικοῦσα ἐν αὐτῷ (viz. τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ) θεότης⁶ or ἄνθρωπος θεοφόρος⁷ or ναὸς τῆς θεότητος⁸, but we find

¹ *De engastrim.* 17, p. 652 A: ὁ λόγος...ἀρετὴ τῆς θεότητος ἀπανταχοῦ πάρεστιν ἀθρόως. εἰ δὲ καὶ...τὸν ἔκκριτον αὐτοῦ ναὸν ἐπέτρεψε λυθῆναι, τριήμερον μὲν αὐτίκα πάλιν ἀνήγειρε (comp. 18, p. 653: θεότητος ἀρετῆς...πάντα πληροῦ)—; Cavallera, 15, p. 72=Migne, p. 685 c: οὐδὲ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ...ἄλλ' ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγειρόμενος ὑψοῦται—; Migne, p. 681 c (Cav. 30): ἀπαθὲς τὸ θεῖον τοῦ Χριστοῦ πνεῦμα—; Migne, p. 693 (Cav. 73): *Si in Christo plenitudo divinitatis inhabitat, aliud...inhabitatur; si vero naturaliter differunt ab alterutris, neque mortis passionem, neque cibi appetitum...plenitudini divinitatis coexistere fas est..., homini vero haec applicanda sunt proprie, qui ex anima constat et corpore—*; Migne, p. 691 (Cav. 65): *hominem causa salutis hominum Verbo coaptavit (συνῆψεν)—*; Migne, p. 684 A (Cav. 27): τὸ μὲν γὰρ σῶμα...ἐσταυροῦτο, τὸ δὲ θεῖον τῆς σοφίας πνεῦμα καὶ τοῦ σώματος εἴσω διητάτο καὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἐπεβάτενε καὶ πᾶσαν περιεῖχε τὴν γῆν—; comp. Migne, 681 B (Cav. 29), p. 684 c (Cav. 28), Cav. 55, p. 90=Migne, p. 689 B, Cav. 83, p. 99 etc.

² Cav. 16, p. 72=Migne, p. 685 c: τοῦ λόγου τε καὶ θεοῦ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ναὸν ἀξιοπρεπῶς ἀναστήσαντος—; comp. Cav. 13, p. 71 and Migne, 677 B (Cav. 25): Joh. 2, 19; Migne, p. 681 c (Cav. 30) and the preceding note.

³ Cav. 14, p. 71 f.=Migne, p. 685 B: *σύνθρονος ἀποδέδεικται τῷ θειοτάτῳ πνεύματι διὰ τὸν οἰκοῦντα θεὸν ἐν αὐτῷ διηνεκῶς.*

⁴ Migne, p. 677 c (Cav. 26), p. 677 c (Cav. 21).

⁵ Migne, p. 680 c (Cav. 20).

⁶ Cav. 12, p. 69=Migne, 688 B: θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθεὶς ὁ χρίστας, ὃ δὲ χρισθεὶς ἐπίκτητον εἰληφεν ἀρετήν, ἔκκριτῷ ναουργίᾳ κοσμηθεὶς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ κατοικοῦντος ἐν αὐτῷ θεότητος, comp. note 3.

⁷ Migne, p. 693 (Cav. 77 and 78): *deiferum hominem; homo deum ferens.*

⁸ Migne, p. 677 B (Cav. 25): *ναὸς γὰρ κυρίως ὁ καθαρὸς καὶ ἄχραντος ἡ κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπόν ἐστι περὶ τὸν λόγον σκηνή, ἔνθα προφανῶς*

him also, however sharply he distinguished between the *Logos* and the man in Christ, asserting the oneness of the *πρόσωπον*, the *μοναδικὸν πρόσωπον*, in contrast to the oneness of the natures which was taught by the Arians¹. He, too, spoke of the *Logos* (or of the pre-existent son of God) as the image of God, and of Christ as the image of the son of God or the image of the archetype of the image of God²; he too—only to mention one further line of thought common to him and Nestorius—dealt with Melchisedek as a type of Christ, in order to refute by means of Hebrews vii. 3 (*ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ*) the idea, that the *Logos* was born³. The theological tradition followed by Nestorius can thus be traced at least to Eustathius.

But it dates from a still earlier period. To prove this, I will start by pointing to the fact that Nestorius himself found in Leo's letter views which agreed with

σκηνώσας φέκησεν ὁ θεός—; Migne, p. 684 c (Cav. 28): *πάσχει μὲν ὁ νεώς*—; comp. p. 109 notes 1, 2 and 6.

¹ Cavallera, 7, p. 67: *μοναδικὸν τὸ πρόσωπον· οὐκ εἶπον μοναδικὴν τὴν φύσιν..., ἀλλ’ εἶπον ἔνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν...ἐν τῷ διαφόρῳ τῷν φύσεων γνωριζόμενον*—; comp. Cav. 82, p. 98.

² Migne, p. 677 c d (Cav. 21): *οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ Παῦλος (Rom. 8, 29) συμμόρφους τοῦ νιοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ νιοῦ αὐτοῦ· ἄλλο μέν τι δεικνύων τὸν νιὸν εἶναι, ἄλλο δὲ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ νιὸς...εἰκὼν ἔστι τοῦ πατρός..., ὁ δὲ ἀνθρωπός, δν ἐφόρεσεν, εἰκὼν ἔστι τοῦ νιοῦ*—; comp. p. 693 (Cav. 70) and Cavallera 45² p. 85: *τὸ γοῦν τῆς ψυχῆς ὅμμα ἀδόλωτον ἔχοντες πρὸς τὸ τῆς (νιότητος?) πρωτότυπον καὶ τῆς εἰκόνος μόρφωμα προσβλέποντες δοξάζομεν τὸ τῆς εἰκόνος ἀρχέτυπον*, comp. Cav. 82, p. 98, where Baruch 3, 36–38 is quoted.

³ Cavallera, 3, p. 63.

his own. Leo was not the author of these views; he, too, followed a tradition which had come down to him. A generation before Leo a very striking agreement with Nestorius is seen in Pelagius, a native of Britain¹. He says about the *Logos*, *quem ubique esse non dubium est: descenderat ad formam servi non localiter, sed dignanter*², and even the following sentence is found in him: *omnes simul hominem adorent cum verbo assumptum*³. It is not wholly improbable that these formulas of Pelagius were influenced by the Antiochian theology, for it is possible that Pelagius visited the East before he came to Rome. But even if Pelagius be left out of consideration (although his utterances may be wholly explained as having their origin in western tradition),—even then a near relationship between the western and the Antiochian tradition can easily be proved. As early as in Tertullian's time, one spoke in the West of two natures of Christ which were not mixed but joined (*conjunctae = συνημμέναι*⁴) and Tertullian himself says⁵: *adeo salva est utriusque*

¹ Comp. Hauck's *Real-encyklopädie* xxiv, 1913, p. 312, 30 ff.

² On Eph. 4, 9, Migne, *ser. lat.* 30, 1846, p. 832 A, comp. Zimmer, *Pelagius in Irland*, p. 365.

³ On Phil. 2, 10, Migne, p. 846 A, Zimmer, l. c. p. 378. Comp. other striking quotations in my *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmen geschichte*, 4th edition, p. 287 f.

⁴ Comp. Tertullian *adv. Praxeum* 27: *Videmus duplicem statum, non confusum, sed conjunctum, in una persona, deum et hominem Jesum.*

⁵ *adv. Praxeum* l. c.

proprietas substantiae, ut et spiritus (i.e. the *Logos*¹) *res suas egerit in illo, id est virtutes, et caro passiones suas functa sit, denique et mortua.* The phrases “*homo Christi*,” “*assumptus homo*” or “*susceptus homo*” are very often found in the west even as late as in Augustine². The idea of the coexistence of the *forma servi* and the *forma dei*, which we found in Nestorius, belonged here to the tradition³, and in Novatian (about 250) we find the idea, returning even in the 8th century in the Adoptianism of Spain, that by the son of God by nature the son of man also, whom he joined to himself and who was not son of God by nature, was made a son of God⁴, and as late as in the 4th century Ambrosius says about the words on the cross: “*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*” *clamavit homo divinitatis separatione moriturus*⁵.

¹ Comp. about Eustathius above p. 109 notes 1 and 3 and about other western theologians Loofs, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis der Homouianer v. Sardica* (*Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie*, 1909, p. 35).

² Comp. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, 4th edition, II, 358 ff.; Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte*, 4th edition, p. 284 ff. Augustine often used the term *dominicu homo* (comp. O. Scheel, *Die Anschauung Augustins von Christi Person und Werk*, 1901, p. 228) and only as late as *Retract* 19, 8 (Migne, *ser. lat.* 32, 616) blamed this expression.

³ Comp. J. B. Lightfoot's Commentary, 127-135; H. Reuter, *Augustinische Studien*, 1887, p. 198 ff.; O. Scheel, I. c. p. 189 ff.; Leo, *ep. ad Flavianum*, ch. 3.

⁴ Novatian *de trin.* 24 (al. 19), Migne, *ser. lat.* 3, 933 c: *legitimus dei filius, qui ex ipso deo est, ... dum sanctum istud* (comp. Luke 1, 35) *assumit, sibi filium hominis annexit et... filium illum dei facit, quod ille naturaliter non fuit.*

⁵ in *Luc.* 10, 127, Migne, *ser. lat.* 15, 1836 A.

There was, it is true, a difference between western and Antiochian thinking, for, while all Antiochians, Nestorius included, even when starting with the *Logos* endeavoured to make intelligible the oneness of the person of Christ, that is, to use Melanchthon's¹ words, to explain the *modus incarnationis*, the Westerners did not trouble themselves with this difficulty. The oneness of the person of the Jesus of history—"person" being here more than the *πρόσωπον* of the Antiochians and nearer to what we understand by "person"—was with the western theologians an indisputable fact, which was presupposed in all their christological explanations. About this one person they asserted, that it was the *filius dei incarnatus* and also that two distinct *substances* or *natures* were clearly to be seen in it². The speculative question as to how this was to be conceived did not occupy the western church; the doctrine of two natures meant here nothing more than that only afterwards one discerned in this one person the two natures; and the presupposition of the oneness of the person of him who was God and man together was here regarded without any efforts of thought as so certain, that because of this oneness of the person the phrases *deus natus est* and *crucifixus est* were used in early times³.

¹ *Loci* of 1521, *Corpus Ref.* 21, 85.

² Comp. above p. 111, note 4.

³ Tertullian, *de carne Christi* 5; Damasus, *epigramma* 91, ed. M. Ihm, p. 94; Reuter, *Augustinische Studien*, p. 205 ff.

The western theologians were, however, aware of the fact, that such phrases were only inaccurate and incomplete statements, for only by virtue of the addition "*ex humana substantia*" did these phrases suit the undivided Christ, while as regards the *Logos* they were nothing more than forms of speech¹.

Nevertheless, in spite of this difference there can, in my opinion, be no doubt, that there must have been a kinship between the western and the Antiochian tradition. Adolf Harnack, it is true, does not admit this. He says that the Antiochians were going the same way as Paul of Samosata², and he even thinks that the explanations of Theodore of Mopsuestia about the relation of the *Logos* and the man in Christ, and about Christ's natures, will, feelings and so on were, here and there, literally identical with those of Paul of Samosata³. The christology of Paul of Samosata, as to itself, is considered by him to be an advanced form of the christology of Hermas and the so-called Monarchians of Rome⁴. Between Tertullian's doctrine of two natures in Christ, however, and the doctrine of the Monarchians he sees no connection; he looks upon Tertullian's doctrine, in so far as it goes farther than Irenaeus on whose works Tertullian was dependent, as formulated by Tertullian

¹ Tertullian *adv. Praxeam* 29 and Reuter 1. c.—Even Leo, *ep. ad Flavianum* 5, says: *filius dei crucifixus dicitur, cum haec non in divinitate ipsa..., sed in naturae humanae sit infirmitate perpessus.*

² *Dogmengeschichte* II¹, 324; II⁴, 339.

³ 1. c. I¹, 599; I⁴, 732.

⁴ I¹, 594; I⁴, 727.

himself and influenced by Gnostic ideas¹. Besides in Harnack it is not clear whether these relations are to be regarded as based on mere resemblance or on real kinship, for he remarks even as regards the connection between Eustathius and the later Antiochians, that in consequence of the many crossings it would be very difficult to prove a direct dependence and influence. He thinks it must suffice to group together what is homogeneous². I cannot share this sceptical attitude—in the course of my research into the history of dogma I have become increasingly more convinced of the influence of tradition—, and the very kinships assumed here by my honoured teacher and friend do not seem to me to be the right ones³. In my opinion the supposition that there was a kinship in tradition between the Antiochian and the western christology seems to be unavoidable because of the close resemblance of the views and the formulas. But what sort

¹ I¹, 474; I⁴, 606.

² II⁴, 341 note 1.

³ I do not deny that there was a kinship in tradition between Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, and the later Antiochians. The famous passages of Paul in the *Doctrina patrum* (ed. Diekamp, p. 303 iv—304 viii), about the genuineness of which I am more doubtful than Harnack (*Dogmengeschichte* I⁴, 724 note 1), especially the most interesting of them (I. c. p. 304 viii: τὰ κρατούμενα τῷ λόγῳ τῆς φύσεως κ.τ.λ.), could have been written by Theodore of Mopsuestia or by Nestorius. But Paul of Samosata was not the creator of the formulas he used; he stood in the same line of tradition as Eustathius, Theodore and Nestorius, although he modified these traditions—perhaps, however (comp. Harnack I⁴, 724 note 2), not in such a degree, as his opponents try to make us believe.

of kinship was it? To answer this question I must enlarge upon two other points, *i.e.* the doctrine of Marcellus of Ancyra and the so-called *Symbolum Sardicense*.

Marcellus of Ancyra, whose huge work is preserved only in fragments¹, does not seem to have occupied himself with the christological question as such, as far as we can judge. It was the Arian *Logos*-doctrine that he opposed; the Arian doctrine as to the Jesus of history was not made an object of discussion by him. Hence it may be explained, that in some places he says: the *Logos* took on *flesh*, and in others: God joined a man to his *Logos*. This latter phrase, it is true, is less often used than the other, but nevertheless it does occur². And it is not this phrase alone which shows resemblance to Nestorius' doctrine; it is also said by Marcellus, that the man joined to the *Logos* became son of God by adoption (*θέσει*)³, and we even find in him the idea, that this

¹ Collected after Rettberg (*Marcelliana*, Göttingen, 1794) by E. Klostermann (*Eusebius Werke* IV, *Gegen Marcell.*, etc., Leipzig, 1906), pp. 185-215. Comp. F. Loofs, *Die Trinitätslehre Marcelli v. Ancyra* (*Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1902, pp. 764-781).

² Klostermann, 74, p. 200, 5 f.: οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν ὃν ἀνείληφεν ἀποβλέπων τοῦτο (John 10, 30) φησιν, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς προελθόντα λόγον—; 1, p. 185, 10: ὅτε τὸν ἀγαπηθέντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνθρωπὸν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ συνῆψεν λόγῳ—; comp. 107, p. 208, 15; 108, p. 208, 22; 117, p. 210, 29.

³ Klostermann, 41, p. 192, 1 ff.: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐχ υἱὸν θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ὄνομάζει, ἀλλὰ... υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου..., ἵνα διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης ὄμολογίας θέσει τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν κοινωνίαν υἱὸν θεοῦ γενέσθαι παρασκευάσῃ.

man joined to the *Logos*¹, after having been exalted, became *σύνθρονος τῷ θεῷ*². Still more of kinship in tradition is to be seen between Marcellus and Nestorius when in Marcellus Christ appears as the beginner of a new humanity. It was for this purpose, that the *Logos* took on the man, viz. that he might assist the man who has been deprived by the devil of his position of glory, in gaining victory over the latter³. He, the man joined to the *Logos*, is the *πρωτότοκος τῆς καινῆς κτίσεως* and the *πρωτότοκος ἐκ νεκρῶν*⁴, the *πρώτος καινὸς ἀνθρωπος*, *εἰς ὃν τὰ πάντα ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι ἐβουλήθη ὁ θεός*⁵, he is the image of the *Logos* and thus of the invisible God⁶, and, having become *κύριος* and *θεός*⁷, he received thereby the firstfruits of the

¹ Klostermann, 42, p. 192, 8 and 109, p. 208, 25: ὁ τῷ λόγῳ ἐνωθεὶς ἀνθρωπος.

² Klostermann, 110, p. 208, 30.

³ 1. c. 108, p. 208, 21 ff.: ἵνα ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου ἀπατηθέντα πρότερον τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν αὐτὸν αὐθις νικῆσαι τὸν διάβολον παρασκευάσῃ· διὰ τοῦτο ἀνείληφεν τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν, ἵνα ἀκολούθως τοῦτον ἀπαρχὴν τῆς ἔξουσίας παραλαβεῖν παρασκευάσῃ.

⁴ 1. c. 2, p. 185, 24: οὐ μόνον τῆς καινῆς κτίσεως πρωτότοκον αὐτὸν ὁ ἀπόστολος εἶναι φησίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρωτότοκον ἐκ νεκρῶν.

⁵ 1. c. 6, p. 186, 18 f.

⁶ 1. c. 94, p. 205, 12 ff.: εἰκὼν ἔστιν τοῦ ἀοράτου θεοῦ· νῦν δηλονότι, ὅπηνίκα τὴν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ γενομένην ἀνείληφε σάρκα...εἰ γάρ διὰ τῆς εἰκόνος ταύτης τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον ἡξιώθημεν γνῶναι, πιστεύειν ὅφειλομεν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τῆς εἰκόνος λέγοντι· ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐσμεν. οὕτε γάρ τὸν λόγον οὕτε τὸν πατέρα τοῦ λόγου χωρὶς τῆς εἰκόνος ταύτης γνῶναι τινα δυνατόν.

⁷ 1. c. 111, p. 209, 1 f.: τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν τὸν πρότερον διὰ τὴν παρακοὴν τῆς βασιλείας ἐκπεπτωκότα κύριον καὶ θεὸν γενέσθαι βουλόμενος ὁ θεὸς ταύτην τὴν οἰκονομίαν ειργάσατο.

position of power which is given back to man¹. Finally it is deserving of notice, that Marcellus, when applying the terms *νιός*, *κύριος* and *Χριστός* only to the Christ of history, is, as regards the two latter terms, in perfect harmony with Nestorius, and that further, as regards the first, Nestorius, too, applied the term after the incarnation only to the undivided historical person of Christ². I have, therefore, no doubt that there existed a kinship in tradition between Marcellus and Nestorius³. I do not mean that Nestorius had necessarily read Marcellus' work. It is probable—if a conjecture as to the text is right—that he once named⁴ him, opposing his idea, that the *Logos*, when going at the end of all things to be reabsorbed into the Father, would put off his flesh; but he could have learned this idea through hearsay. Marcellus and Nestorius could have a kinship in

¹ See p. 117, note 3, comp. above p. 89 at note 8.

² See above p. 86.

³ In consideration of the fact that a common kinship of two persons to a third one proves them to be akin to one another, I notice that we find in Marcellus and Eustathius the same understanding of the *όμοούσιος* as excluding *persons* (*ὑποστάσεις*) in the Trinity, the same use of *πνεῦμα* as applied to the *Logos*, the same quotation of Baruch, 3, 36–38 (comp. above p. 110, note 2, and Marcellus, fragm. 70, p. 202, 20 ff.) and the same striking explanation of Prov. 8, 22 (comp. Eustathius, fragm. Cavallera, 33, p. 77: ἀρχὴ γάρ τοι τῶν καλλίστων τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὁδῶν γεγένηται ἡμῖν ὁ ἀνθρωπος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῖς κρείττονι τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων προσάγων ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ. and Marcell, fragm. 9–15, Klostermann, p. 186 f.).

⁴ *Nestorian*, p. 298, 23, where Marcellus is substituted for *Manichaeus*.

tradition even if Nestorius did not know Marcellus' work. Besides it is perhaps remarkable, that Nestorius who so zealously anathematises all heretics never put Marcellus on such a black list.

Likewise it seems to me without doubt, that there is a kinship in tradition between Nestorius and the so-called *Symbolum Sardicense*¹. In the beginning of this creed Ursacius and Valens, "the Arians," as they are called, are blamed because they pretended to be Christians, and nevertheless dared to say, that the "*Logos* or *Spirit*" was wounded, slain, died and rose again². Correspondingly the creed declares at the end, that not the *Spirit* in Christ (i.e. the *Logos*) suffered, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνθρωπός, δὸν ἐνεδύσατο, δὸν ἀνέλαβεν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν τὸν παθεῖν δυνάμενον³, and it asserts as to the resurrection that not ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνθρωπός ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἀνέστη⁴. This conformity of views between the *Sardicense* and Nestorius is really not surprising, for the *Sardicense* is of western origin and we have already seen that since Tertullian's time the western tradition included a doctrine of the two natures of Christ, which resembled that of Nestorius⁵.

¹ I quote the revised text I gave in *Das Glaubensbekenntnis der Homousianer von Sardica* (*Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie*, 1909) pp. 7-11.

² 3, p. 7, 7-10. ³ 11, p. 10, 53-55. ⁴ *ib.* p. 10, 55 f.

⁵ Comp. the references to western theologians I gave in the notes of *Das Glaubensbekenntnis* etc. (p. 11 ff.).

Moreover, as regards the relation between Nestorius and the *Sardicense* another point, too, is to be discussed. I must go a roundabout way to show this. First, attention must be drawn to the fact that the *Sardicense* had a particular kinship with Marcellus¹. Like Marcellus, the *Sardicense* declares that the term *πρωτότοκος*, if used of Christ, is applied to him as to the new creature, *i.e.* as to the beginner of the new humanity². Like Marcellus, it understands the eternity of the *Logos*, not as Origen did as an eternal existence beside God the Father, but as the eternal existence in him up to the time when he issued from God³. Like Marcellus, the *Sardicense* contends that God and his *Logos* have one *ὑπόστασις*⁴. Like Marcellus, it identifies the *λόγος ἄστρος* and the Spirit of God⁵; and like Marcellus, it assumes, that from the historical Christ the Spirit of God proceeded and went over to the disciples⁶. Like

¹ This, too, is proved in the notes mentioned in the preceding note.

² Comp. above p. 117, note 4, and *Sardicense*, 7, p. 9: ὁμολογοῦμεν μονογενῆ καὶ πρωτότοκον· ἀλλὰ μονογενῆ τὸν λόγον, ὃς πάντοτε ἦν καὶ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ· τὸ πρωτότοκος δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ διαφέρει (*i.e.* refers to the man) καὶ τῇ καυνῇ κτίσει, ὅτι καὶ πρωτότοκος ἐκ νεκρῶν.

³ Comp. the preceding note.

⁴ *Sardicense*, 4, p. 7: ἡμεῖς δὲ ταύτην παρειλήφαμεν...πίστιν καὶ ὁμολογίαν· μίαν εἶναι ὑπόστασιν,...τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ νιοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος.

⁵ *Sardicense*, 11, p. 10: καὶ τοῦτο (viz. τὸ πνεῦμα) πιστεύομεν πεμφθέν· καὶ τοῦτο οὐ πέπονθεν, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνθρωπός, διὸ ἐνεδύσατο.

⁶ This cannot be proved by a single quotation; but evidence is given in my papers *Die Trinitätslehre Marcells* (p. 771 ff.) and *Das*

Marcellus, therefore, the *Sardicense* teaches an economic-trinitarian monotheism, *i.e.* the Trinity does not appear here as eternal, but as produced in the course of the economy, *i.e.* of God's dispensation. God was according to Marcellus originally an absolute *μονάς*, then the *Logos* issued from him as his *δραστικὴ ἐνέργεια* without being separated from him *δυνάμει*, and then from the *incarnate Logos* the Spirit proceeded, the Spirit of God, who was in him and went over to the Christian community. These views were without doubt shared by the *Sardicense*, although they are not all definitely expressed. It did not even blame another idea of Marcellus which is closely connected with these views, viz. that just as the divine *μονάς* has been extended, the Spirit and the *Logos* will finally be reabsorbed in God in order that God may be all in all; for this idea, in spite of all opposition to it on the part of Marcellus' enemies, is passed over in silence by the *Sardicense*, and, as I have shown elsewhere¹, this silence was not merely the result of church-policy, *i.e.* it cannot be explained by the fact, that Marcellus, in contradiction to the majority of the eastern bishops but in harmony with the western, held to the Nicene creed. The real reason was, that the idea of Marcellus here in question corresponded to a tradition found in Tertullian and Novatian

Glaubensbekenntnis etc. (p. 31 ff.). Also regarding the statements which follow above I must refer to these papers.

¹ In the papers mentioned note 6, p. 120.

and found in the western church as late as the middle of the 4th century¹.

Now it is theoretically possible that Marcellus was influenced by the western tradition existing long before his time, although it is very improbable that western tradition could have made such an impression on an eastern theologian. Actually, however, this is quite

¹ Comp. my paper *Das Glaubensbekenntnis* etc., p. 31-34. Only four quotations may be given here: Tertullian, *adv. Praxeum*, ch. 4 ed. Kroymann, p. 232, 16 ff.: *cum autem subjecta erunt illi omnia absque eo, qui ei subjecit omnia, tunc et ipse subjecetur illi, qui ei subjecit omnia, ut sit deus omnia in omnibus* (1 Kor. 15, 28). *videmus igitur non obesse monarchiae [filium], etsi hodie apud filium est, quia et in suo statu est apud filium et cum suo statu restituetur patri a filio.*—Novatian, *de trin.* 3, Migne, ser. lat. 3, 952 a: *subjectis enim ei quasi filio omnibus rebus a patre etc.* (1 Kor. 15, 28), *totam divinitatis auctoritatem rursus patri remittit; unus deus ostenditur verus et aeternus pater, a quo solo haec vis divinitatis emissa et jam in filium tradita et directa rursum per substantiae communionem ad patrem revolvitur.*—Victorinus Afer († cire. 363), *adv. Arianos*, 1, 39, Migne, ser. lat. 8, p. 1070 d: *evacuatis enim omnibus, requiescit activa potentia* (i.e. the *Logos*) *et erit in ipso deo secundum quod est esse et secundum quod est quiescere, et in aliis autem spiritualiter secundum suam et potentiam et substantiam, et hoc est* “*ut sit deus omnia in omnibus,*” *non enim omnia in unoquoque, sed deo existente in omnibus, et ideo omnia erit deus, quod omnia erunt deo plena.*—Zeno of Verona (about 370), after having quoted 1 Kor. 15, 24 ff. on the one side and Luke 1, 32 (*regni ejus non erit finis*) and Sap. 3, 4 ff. (*regnabit dominus eorum in perpetuum*) on the other: *quid hoc est? si in perpetuum regnat, Paulus erravit; si traditurus est regnum, isti mentiuntur. absit! nullus hic error, diversitas nulla est. Paulus enim de hominis assumpti temporali locutus est regno..., hi autem ad principalem vim retulerunt, in cuius perpetuitate commanens in aeternum, a patre filius regnum nec accepit aliquando, nec posuit; semper enim cum ipso regnavit.*

impossible; for it is admitted by all that the origin of the ideas of Marcellus can be sufficiently explained by an earlier eastern theological tradition. This latter is seen in Irenaeus, a native of Asia Minor, about 185, although it is in him influenced by the quite different views of the apologists¹. Before Irenaeus it is to be found in the utterances of the presbyters of Asia Minor which are quoted in several places by Irenaeus². Even in the beginning of the second century, about 110, we meet ideas resembling the fundamental thoughts of Marcellus in Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, who, as is shown in the course of his last journey through Asia Minor and by his relation to the Gospel of John, must have had intercourse with Asia Minor before becoming bishop. Like Marcellus, Ignatius assumes that the *Logos* of God is not begotten³; like Marcellus and differing from the apologists, he applies the term *Son of God* only to the historical and exalted Christ⁴; like Marcellus he nevertheless speaks about an issuing of the *Logos* from God⁵; like Marcellus, he says that God, when the *Logos* issued from him, broke his silence⁶, *i.e.* opened

¹ Comp. my *Dogmengeschichte*, 4th edition, § 21, 2d, p. 143 f.

² I. c. § 15, 6, p. 103.

³ ad *Ephes.* 7, 2: *εἰς ιατρός ἐστιν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητὸς (as σαρκικός) καὶ ἀγέννητος (as πνευματικός) κ.τ.λ.*

⁴ Comp. the preceding note and ad *Smyrn.* 1, 1: *νιὸν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν θεοῦ γεγεννημένον...έκ παρθένου.*

⁵ ad *Magn.* 7, 2: *Ιησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ἀφ' ἑνὸς πατρὸς προελθόντα.*

⁶ Marcellus, fragm. 103, Klostermann, p. 207, 25: *πρὸ γὰρ τῆς δημιουργίας ἀπάσης ἡσυχία τις ἦν, ὡς εἰκύς, ὅντος ἐν τῷ θεῷ τοῦ*

the economy, *i.e.* his dispensation which was intended for the world's salvation; like Marcellus, he speaks about the *οἰκονομία εἰς τὸν καὶ νὸν ἀνθρωπὸν*, *i.e.* about the dispensation of God which gave in Christ a new beginning to the humanity¹; like Marcellus, he probably identified the *λόγος* and the Spirit of God as regards the time before the Spirit went over from the historical Christ to his disciples². For him as for Marcellus the historical Christ is at once God revealed in flesh and the new and perfect man³. Finally, it is not improbable that Ignatius, too, supposed that the *Logos* and the Spirit would at last be reabsorbed in God⁴.

Hence dependence of Marcellus on the western tradition is excluded from possibility. There is also another argument against it, viz. that even in Tertullian the western tradition shows itself influenced by the λόγον—; Ignatius, *ad Smyrn.* 8, 2: 'Ιησοῦν Χριστοῦ τοῦ νιοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὃς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ συγῆς προελθών.

¹ As regards Marcellus comp. above p. 117, notes 4 and 5, and Klostermann, Index s.v. *οἰκονομία*; Ignatius, *ad Ephes.* 20, 1: *οἰκονομία εἰς τὸν καὶ νὸν ἀνθρωπὸν* 'Ιησοῦν Χριστόν and *ad Smyrn.* 4, 2: 'Ιησοῦν Χριστοῦ...τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου γενομένου.

² In Ignatius, *ad Philad. inscriptio*, the *πνεῦμα ἄγιον* is *τὸ ἄγιον Χριστοῦ πνεῦμα*, while, according to *ad Smyrn.* 3, 3, Christ was on earth *πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρὶ*; and *ad Rom.* 7, 2, Ignatius apparently had in mind John 7, 38 f.

³ Comp. above note 1 and *ad Ephes.* 19, 3: *θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερούμένου εἰς καὶ νότητα αἰδίους ζῶντας*.

⁴ It seems to me not improbable, that in Ignatius *ad Magnes.* 7, 2 is to be read: *ἐπὶ ἔνα 'Ιησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ἀφ' ἐνὸς πατρὸς προελθόντα* (comp. p. 123, note 5) *καὶ εἰς ἔνα δύτα* (comp. John 1, 18) *καὶ εἰς ἔνα χωρήσοντα* (instead of *χωρήσαντα*).

views of the apologists¹, who, to take only one example, applied the term "Son of God" to the pre-existent *Logos* and did not comprehend that the historical Christ was even as the Son of God the beginner of a new humanity².

The western tradition, therefore, must be traced back to the very pre-apologetic views which gave birth to the tradition followed by Marcellus. And this connection is at least recognisable for us in one place; for we find that Tertullian was strongly influenced by Irenaeus and Melito, both natives of Asia Minor, and by the Montanistic movement which arose in the same country.

This is the line of tradition in which Nestorius, too, has his place. That has been proved by what I have said about his relation to Eustathius, Marcellus, and the *Sardicense*.

The old tradition shows in him, it is true, in many respects an altered face. Origen had strengthened the influence of the apologists; Nestorius, too, shows many signs of this influence. But the old tradition seems to have

¹ The influence of the apologists on Tertullian needs not to be proved; about the older traditions, which are clearly seen in him, comp. W. Macholz, *Spuren binitarischer Denkweise im Abendlande*, *dissert. theol. Halensis*, 1902, pp. 35-57.

² There are in Tertullian remains of the pre-apologetic understanding of the term "Son of God," e.g. *adv. Praxeum*, 26, ed. Kroymann, p. 277, 26: *dicens* (viz. the angel in Luke 1, 35) *autem "Spiritus dei"* *portionem totius* (viz. *substantiae divinae*) *intelligi voluit, quae cessura erat in filii nomen.*

had more influence on him than on the famous earlier teachers of his school. The tendency of his christology to start from the historical Christ and to apply not only the terms *Χριστός* and *κύριος* but also the term *Son of God* only to the historical Lord¹ probably did not come only from his own endeavour to lay stress on the oneness of the historical person of Christ, but must have had a connection with the old tradition which had come down to him.

If all this is right Nestorius is justified in his thinking in a higher degree than if he had been shown to be orthodox in the sense of the later orthodoxy; for then he is nearer to the oldest theological tradition and nearer to the N.T. than this later orthodoxy itself.

Only two remarks are to be made in this respect. We are accustomed to the orthodox trinitarian and christological formulas as they appear when detached from the whole to which they originally belonged. Hence we do not see that in these formulas a mythology, actually contradicting the monotheistic belief, had gained the victory.

This is, however, shown just by the contrast between Nestorius and the Cyrillian orthodoxy. The council of 553 sanctioned, as we saw², the statement of the Scythian monks *τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον σαρκὶ...εἶναι ἐνα τῆς ἀγίας*

¹ Comp. *Nestoriania, Index*, s.v. *Χριστός*, *κύριος*, *νιός* and above, p. 86.

² Above p. 105 at note 7.

τριάδος. What weight this sanction had is illustrated by the remark of the same council, that the Holy Trinity did not receive any addition when "one of the Trinity" became man¹. This remark is purposely directed against Nestorius, who himself deals with the reproach, that his doctrine led to the result, that the man in Christ was added to the Trinity as the fourth person². He did not give a satisfactory answer to this reproach³. Nor did Marcellus master the difficulty. For him the problem did not lie in the fact, that on account of the flesh, he had to regard the historical and exalted Christ as another beside God, in spite of his dynamic unity with God, for this is undoubtedly the view held by the N.T. also; but he confesses, that he did not know, what would become of the manhood (*flesh*) of Christ, when the *Logos* should finally be reabsorbed in the unity of God, so that God might be all in all⁴. There was no difficulty here for the old tradition; for when finally all Christians are made perfect and wholly filled with the Spirit of God, then naturally the beginner of the new humanity would no longer have a peculiar position to himself, although

¹ Anath. 5: οὕτε γὰρ προσθήκην προσώπου ἡ ὑποστάσεως ἐπεδέξατο ἡ ἀγία τριάς καὶ σαρκωθέντος τοῦ ἐνὸς τῆς ἀγίας τριάδος, θεοῦ λόγου.

² Liber Heracl. B. 33=N. 19; B. 34=N. 20; B. 38=N. 23.

³ B. 360=N. 231 (comp. note 4): *Le prosôpon de l'humanité n'est pas odieux à la trinité*; what is said B. 33 f.=N. 20 suffices just as little.

⁴ Klostermann, 121, p. 211.

God with his *Logos* would not cease to dwell in him; for God will be all in all¹.

But I shall not discuss this longer nor enter into the question as to whether the old tradition followed by Nestorius can be accepted by us, and if so, how². The main thing for me is to contrast this tradition with the trinitarian doctrine of the council of 553. Here the Holy Trinity has become something through the incarnation which it was not before³. As regards the time before, it is to some extent a conceivable idea, that the three *ὑποστάσεις*, although they are regarded as in such a way independent of each other that one alone can become man, nevertheless together make the one God; for all three *ὑποστάσεις* are of the same spiritual substance. But after the incarnation, the Trinity is the triad of the merely spiritual Father, of the crucified (*i.e.* the *Logos* united with human flesh, soul and intellect), and of the Spirit⁴. This understanding of the Trinity is represented by the terrible

¹ Comp. the closing sentences of Irenaeus *adv. haer.* (5. 36, 2): *Etenim unus filius, qui voluntatem patris perfecit, et unum genus humanum, in quo perficiuntur mysteria dei, quem (read quae) concupiscunt angeli videre et non praevalent investigare sapientiam dei, per quam plasma ejus conformatum et concorporatum filio perficitur; ut progenies ejus primogenitus (=πρωτότοκος; hence not “primogenita”), Verbum, descendat in facturam, hoc est in plasma, et capiatur ab eo, et factura iterum capiat Verbum et ascendat ad eum, supergrediens angelos, et fiet secundum imaginem et similitudinem dei.*

² Comp. the closing remarks in my Oberlin-lectures “*What is the truth about Jesus Christ?*” (New York, 1913) pp. 237-241.

³ Cp. *ibid.* p. 174.

⁴ Cp. *ibid.* p. 175 note.

mediaeval pictures of the Trinity which show an old man holding up the Crucifix by the arms of the cross with a dove hovering above. That is certainly not the one God of the Christian belief! Nestorius, like Augustine, was convinced that the *opera trinitatis sunt indivisa*¹. And only if we go back to the old economic-trinitarian tradition, will the trinitarian doctrine be compatible with monotheism.

The same is to be said about the doctrine of the incarnation. Cyril thought he had treated the idea of incarnation in a serious manner. He, too, however, did not assume that the *Logos* was confined by the body of Jesus during his earthly life; the *Logos* remained, according to him, pervading the world, and this by his Godhead alone². As regards the time after the ascension, the same must be assumed. Then also in Cyril something heterogeneous is added to the Trinity by the manhood of Christ and, what is still more noticeable, the idea of *incarnation* appears as not sharply distinguished from that of *inspiration*. Mythological and popular thought may imagine an incarnation perfectly distinguished from inspiration, but the theology of the ancient church did not dare to do so. Luther was the first, who endeavoured to think out such a doctrine

¹ *Nestoriana*, p. 225, 13 ff.; *Liber Heracl.* B. 326 = N. 208.

² ep. 17 (synodica) Migne, ser. graeca, 77, p. 112 c: ἐνωθεῖς γὰρ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος σαρκὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν, θεὸς μέν ἔστι τῶν ὅλων, δεσπόζει δὲ τοῦ παντός.

of incarnation, and he did this by means of his idea of Christ's bodily ubiquity, which began with the first moment of his conception and remained even during the time when Christ's corpse lay in the grave. However, by following this line of thought, we arrive at mere absurdities¹. And if thus the endeavour to think out the idea, that the *Logos* assumed the manhood in his *ὑπόστασις*, leads us to absurdities, then we must go further back than the first beginnings of this doctrine, which are made by nothing other than the introduction of popular mythological views into the Christian theology. Only by returning to the lines of the Antiochian theology, along which in Germany *e.g.* I. A. Dorner and M. Kaehler went and R. Seeberg and others now are going², can we arrive at an understanding of the Johannine “*ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*,” which is in harmony with the N.T. and avoids theological and rational impossibilities.

¹ Comp. Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie* x, 258, 41–260, 21.

² Comp. the lectures mentioned above (p. 128, note 2) pp. 228–35.

INDEX OF NAMES

- Acacius (of Beroea) 52
Aëtius 2
Alcuin 107
Ambrosius 112
Apollinaris 8, 65, 66, 67
Aristolaus 55
Aristotle 71
Arius 2, 67
Arthebas 55
Athanasius 8, 70, 88
Augustine 9, 112, 129
Auscha'nâ 11

Bedjan 11, 12, 13
Bethune-Baker 11, 12, 13, 14, 19,
 22, 26, 66, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76,
 78, 81, 82, 101, 107
Brooks 9

Candidian 47, 49
Cassian 43
Celestine (of Rome) 31, 42, 43,
 44, 58, 64
Chairemon 33
Chrysoretes 55, 56
Chrysostomus 7, 23
Cook, Stanley A. 6
Cosmas 3, 4
Cyril 4, 5, 12, 15, 17, 25, 29,
 31, 33-56, 58, 62, 63, 64, 69-
 74, 77, 78, 79, 95-100, 102,
 103, 104, 105, 129

Dalmatius 28, 56
Diodor (of Tarsus) 103, 108
Dioscorus 98
Dorner 130
Droseria 55
Duval 9

Ebed Jesu 3, 4, 5, 6
Epiphanius 55
Eudoxius 67
Eunomius 2, 67
Eusebius (of Dorylaeum) 32
Eustathius 108-110, 115, 125
Eutyches 25, 56, 97
Evagrius 4, 5, 12, 13, 18, 57, 58

Fendt 7
Flavian 2, 22, 24, 25, 59, 75, 95

Gregorius Nazianzenus 85
Gregorius Thaumaturgos 8

Harnack 114, 115
Haidacher 7
Hefele 37, 48
Heraclides 13, 14
Hieronymus 9, 10
Hume 71

Ibas 99, 104, 105
Ignatius 123, 124
Irenaeus (of Lyons) 114, 123,
 125
Irenaeus (of Tyrus) 5

John of Antioch 30, 31, 32, 44,
 47, 54-59, 62, 63
John (count) 49, 51, 52
Julius (of Rome) 8
Justinian 104

Kähler 92, 130
Kampffmeyer 6
Katterfeld 39

Lausus 56

- Lebègue 39
 Leo (of Rome) 2, 22, 24, 25, 59,
 64, 75, 95, 96-98, 100-102,
 110, 111
 Locke 71
 Luther 20, 21, 61, 129
- Marcella 55, 56
 Marcellus (of Aneyra) 2, 116-
 119, 120, 121-125, 127
 Maris 99
 Marius Mercator 4, 7, 34, 38
 Maximian 51, 53, 55
 Melanchthon 113
 Melito 125
 Memnon 46-49, 51
- Nau 12, 13, 16, 23, 24
 Nestorius 1-9, 11-54, 56-65, 67-
 89, 90, 91-96, 99-101, 106-108,
 110, 111, 113, 116-120, 125-
 129
 Novatian 112, 121, 122
- Olympias 55
- Paul of Samosata 20, 32, 114,
 115
 Paulus (praepositus) 55
 Pelagius 9, 10, 42, 111
 Peltan 39
 Philoxenus 24, 25
 Photinus 20, 29
- Priscillian 10, 11
 Pulcheria 42, 52, 55, 56, 65
- Romanus 55
- Sardicense symbolum 116, 119-
 121
 Schepss (sic! not Schepps) 11
 Scholasticus 52, 55
 Seeberg, R. 130
 Severus 8, 96
 Simon Bar Tabbahê 24
 Socrates 20, 61
 Sophronius 14
 Souter 10
- Tertullian 111, 114, 119, 121,
 122, 124, 125
 Theodore of Mopsuestia 65, 77,
 103, 104, 108, 114
 Theodoret 54, 56, 59, 98, 99, 105
 Theodosius II (emperor) 3, 19,
 27, 35-37, 45, 47-51, 53, 57, 58
- Ursacius 119
- Valens 119
 Victor 33
 Victorinus Afer 122
- Zeno (emperor) 101
 Zeno (of Verona) 122
 Zimmer 9, 10

LOAN PERIOD 1 HOME USE	2	3
4	5	6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

1-month loans may be renewed by calling 642-3405

1-year loans may be recharged by bringing the book

Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date.

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

FORM NO. DD6, 60m, 1/83

BERKELEY, CA 94720

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



CO47796622

